ROMANISM

BX1767
.W5

ROMANISM

IN THE LIGHT OF ITS MOST RECENT AND AUTHORITATIVE EXPOSITIONS AMONGST US.

A SERIES OF LETTERS;

WITH QUOTATIONS FROM ORIGINAL SOURCES, HITHERTO UNKNOWN TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

BY

T. D. WITHERSPOON, D. D.,

PASTOR OF TABB STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, PETERSBURG, VA.

RICHMOND, VA.:
PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.
ST. LOUIS, MO.:
PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

THE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary
RICHMOND, VA.

THE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary
RICHMOND, VA.

KJ
96.5
W824

PREFATORY STATEMENT.

In June, 1880, as I sat one day in my study, a gentleman of Petersburg came in, bringing the MS. of a tract headed, "WHAT DO ROMAN CATHOLICS BELIEVE," and asked me, as I had a copy of the work from which the extracts in the tract were made, to be kind enough to compare the quotations with the original text, see that they were accurate and fair, and join with other Protestant ministers of the city in a certificate to that effect. He gave as the reason for this request that many intelligent Protestants would not believe that the Roman Catholic Church taught the doctrines contained in these quotations, and would believe the quotations spurious unless their accuracy were certified to by persons in whom they had confidence. I made the examination, found the quotations perfectly accurate and fair, appended my name to the certificate, and never saw the MS. afterwards, nor a copy of the printed tract, until, hearing that the "authors" were accused of garbling and false representation, I sent and procured a copy, to see if there were any typographical errors upon which so base a charge could be founded. Finding none, I felt it my duty to vindicate myself as one of the endorsers of the accuracy of the compiler. This brought a rejoinder from the assailants; and so a newspaper controversy began, of which these letters are the fruit.

In revising them for publication, I have made a few alterations omitting, as far as possible, all personalities however inoffensive, and all that part of the controversy which was purely local or temporary in interest. I have preserved only so much as was necessary to show what are the present teachings of the Roman Catholic Church in this country. The works from which I quote, though altogether unknown up to this time to the general public, are being secretly taught, and have been secretly taught for years, in those Roman Catholic seminaries to which Protestant parents have been thoughtless enough to send their children.

Let every Protestant parent read, and ask himself the question, Am I prepared to place my child under the influence of such teachings as are found in the quotations here made from text books by living authors, and used in Roman Catholic seminaries all around us?

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

TABB ST. MANSE.
PETERSBURG, VA., May 4th, 1881.

The Jarratt's Depot Tract.

WHAT DO ROMAN CATHOLICS BELIEVE?

Archbishop Gibbons declares, (*Faith of our Fathers*, page 13), "There is no Freemasonry in the Catholic Church; she has no secrets to keep back. She has not one set of doctrines for Bishops and Priests and another for the laity. She has not one creed for the initiated and another for outsiders." If the Archbishop expresses the sentiments of Catholics in this country, they will all be very glad to have their doctrines generally known, and this tract will be of real servite to them.

The following quotations are made from a book bought from the teachers of the Roman Catholic school in Petersburg, Va., several copies of which procured from them are now in possession of citizens of Petersburg. If any question is raised as to the accuracy and fairness of these quotations the question can very easily be settled. The title page of the book is: "*Familiar Explanation of Christian Doctrine. Adapted for the family and more advanced students in Catholic*

Schools and Colleges. With the approbation of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. No. III. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1877." The author is Rev. M. Muller.

ROMAN CATHOLICS BELIEVE THEIR DOCTRINES ARE NOT DEPENDENT ON THE BIBLE.

Page 83. "*Q.* Are the doctrines of the Catholic Church then entirely independent of Scripture?

A. They are: because she taught her doctrines, and they were believed by the early Christians before the New Testament was written—centuries, indeed, before the Bible was collected in its present form; and she would have done so in precisely the same manner, had they never been written."

ROMAN CATHOLICS BELIEVE THERE IS NO SALVATION OUTSIDE THEIR CHURCH.

Page 87. Lesson XII. "*No Salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church. Q.* Since the Roman Catholic Church alone is the true Church of Jesus Christ, can any one who dies outside of the Church be saved?

A. He cannot.

Q. Why not?

A. Because one who does not do the will of God cannot be saved.

Q. Is it then the will of God that all men should be Catholics?

A. Yes: because it is only in the Roman Catholic Church that they can learn the will of God! that is the full doctrine of Jesus Christ, which alone can save them."

Page 88. "*Q.* What do the Fathers of the Church say about the salvation of those who die out of the Roman Catholic Church?

A. They all, without exception, pronounce them infallibly lost forever."

Page 91. "*Q.* Are there any other reasons to show that heretics, or Protestants who die out of the Roman Catholic Church, are not saved?

A. There are several. They cannot be saved, because

1. They have no divine faith.

2. They make a liar of Jesus Christ, of the Holy Ghost and of the Apostles.

3. They have no faith in Christ.

4. They fell away from the true Church of Christ.

5. They are too proud to submit to the Pope, the vicar of Christ.

6. They cannot perform any good works whereby they can obtain heaven.

7. They do not receive the Body and Blood of Christ.

8. They die in their sins.

9. They ridicule and blaspheme the Mother of God and His saints.

10. They slander the spouse of Jesus Christ—the Catholic Church."

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS STRIKE FROM THE DECALOGUE THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

Page 170. "*Q.* Say the ten commandments.

A. 1. I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no God but me.

2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

3. Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day.

4. Honor thy Father and thy Mother.

5. Thou shalt not kill.

6. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

7. Thou shalt not steal.

8. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.

10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods."

The reader will observe that the 2nd commandment, as given in the 20th chapter of Exodus, and which forbids the making and worshipping of images, is omitted; while to make up the number 10, the last commandment, forbiding coveting, is divided into two. Roman Catholics admit that the 2d commandment is part of the Bible, for their

versions of the Bible contain it, and yet they strike it out.

ROMAN CATHOLICS BELIEVE THT PRIESTS HAVE THE POWER TRULY TO FORGIVE SINS.

Page 375. "*Q.* Does the priest truly forgive the sins, or does he only declare that they are forgiven?

A. Keys are not given to a person that he may *declare* the gate to be open, but that he may have the power either to open or shut it. Thus also the power of forgiving sins is not given to priests, in order that they may *declare* sins to be forgiven, but that they may really and truly forgive or retain them."

Also page 377. "*Q.* But would not God forgive our sins, if we were to confess them to him alone?

A. By no means, as otherwise the full power, which Christ gave to the priests of forgiving and retaining sins, would be vain and useless."

The book from which these extracts are made was written by one Roman Catholic priest, and edited by another, copyrighted by another, and published by Catholics—"Printers to the Holy Apostolic See." It was also published "with the Approbation of the Sacred Congregation for the propagation of the Faith," and is used in Catholic schools and colleges. What this book says may therefore be implicitly relied upon as the *real* doc-

trine of Roman Catholics. The book has also the *imprimatur* of Archbishop J. R. Bayley.

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that we have compared the above quotations with the book from which they are taken, and that they are entirely accurate and fair.

T. T. EATON,
Pastor 1st Baptist Church.

T. D. WITHERSPOON,
Pastor Tabb St. Presb. Church.

CHURCHILL J. GIBSON,
Rector of Grace Church.

J. D. BLACKWELL,
Pastor Wash. St. M. E. Church.

LETTER I.

THAT JARRATT'S DEPOT TRACT.

PETERSBURG, VA., July 8, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—You have doubtless heard of the sensation produced a few days since by the distribution at Jarratt's Depot of a "four-page tract," entitled, "What Roman Catholics believe." Sensational telegrams were sent to the *Richmond Whig*, *New York Herald*, and other papers, complaining of the outrage perpetrated by the Protestants in circulating this tract. I enclose you a copy of it from which you will see that it consists simply and exclusively of extracts from a Catechism prepared by a Catholic as an exponent of Catholic doctrine, and issued with the imprimatur of Archbishop Bayley of Baltimore. The awful offence then committed by these Protestants is the same that would be committed by Roman Catholics if they should make a number of extracts from the Shorter Catechism, and publish them as a tract, headed, "What Presbyterians believe." If they will only do that, we, so far from complaining, will be very much obliged to them. We do not fear to have the public know what we believe and teach, but it seems that they do. They become

very indignant because we call attention to doctrines that they are teaching every day in their schools. It may be that those into whose hands the tracts fell, were injudicious as to the time and place of distribution. If so it is very much to be regretted, as the ministers who certified to the correctness of the quotations had no idea that any use would be made of the tract which could properly be considered discourteous. But our Roman Catholic friends not only complain of the discourtesy in circulating the tract, but accuse the compiler and the ministers who certified to his accuracy and fairness, with misrepresentation of the teachings of the author from whom the quotations are made. The correspondent of the *Whig* says, "many of which" (alluding to the quotations) "the Catholics declare to be utterly false;" and a writer in the *Catholic Visitor* of the 3d inst., who signs himself "Rufus," speaks of the four ministers as the "garbling authors," &c. As this charge involves the moral character of the ministers in question, I solemnly affirm, and defy all contradiction, that these quotations are not only accurate, but that they are *the full answer in every case* to the question, without the omission of one word or letter. And when "Rufus" undertakes to explain away the meaning of some of these answers he has to draw from another book altogether. He cannot find a word to sustain him in the book from which we quote, Muller's Catechism No. 3. He

has to refer his readers to the Catechism No. 2, by the same author, which is a distinct work, separately bound, and having no necessary connection with the one from which the quotations were made to which we referred as accurate and fair.

But perhaps some further quotations from the same work may serve to relieve us from this charge of garbling. So I give your readers a few this week and will give more next week. I always like, as far as space will permit, to do an author full justice.

"*Question.* Is to believe what the Roman Catholic Church teaches not the same as to believe God Himself?

Answer. It is indeed.

Q. Are the doctrines of the Catholic Church then entirely independent of Scripture?

A. They are, etc." (See answer in tract.)

"*Q.* What then is the principal motive why Catholics believe the truths of their religion: is it because these truths are found in Holy Scripture or because the pastors of the Catholic Church teach them?

A. They believe these truths only because God teaches them through the pastors of the Church, so much so that, as St. Augustine says, we would not believe even the Bible if the Catholic Church did not assure us that it is the written word of God."

So much for the first point as to the doctrines of Catholics not being dependent on the Bible. You see there has been no garbling there.

Now as to the second point—"no salvation out of the Roman Catholic Church,"—this writer has the following questions which, I quote only giving the answers in so far as may be necessary to show the relations, which in the author's view, Protestants sustain to salvation.

After asking the three very charitable (!) questions: "How do Protestants make a liar of Jesus Christ?" "How do Protestants make a liar of the Holy Ghost?" "How do Protestants make liars of the Apostles?" He continues.

"*Q.* Now do you think the Father will admit into heaven those who thus make liars of His Son Jesus Christ, of the Holy Ghost, and of the Apostles?

A. No, He will let them have their portion with Lucifer in hell, who first rebelled against Christ and who is the father of liars.

Q. Have Protestants any faith in Christ?

A. They never had.

Q. Why?

A. Because there never lived such a Christ as they imagine and believe in.

Q. In what kind of a Christ do they believe?

A. In such a one of whom they can make a liar with impunity, etc.

Q. Do Protestants receive the body and blood of our Lord?

A. No, etc.

Q. What follows from this?

A. They will not enter into life everlasting, and deservedly so, because they abolished the holy sacrifice of the mass.

Q. Do Protestants commit other mortal sins besides those above mentioned?

A. Very many besides.

Q. Do they die in the sins of apostasy, blasphemy, slander, etc.?

A. They do, etc.

Q. Are Protestants willing to confess their sins to a Catholic bishop or priest, etc.?

A. No, etc.?

Q. What follows from this?

A. That they die in their sins and are damned.

Q. But is it not a very uncharitable doctrine to say that none can be saved out of the Church?

A. On the contrary it is a very great act of charity to assert this doctrine most emphatically."

These *very charitable* doctrines concerning Protestants and their relation to salvation, are taken from a Catechism which is being taught *every day in the Roman Catholic schools and convents to which Protestant children are being sent for cheap education.* These are the doctrines of the Church which is seeking to commend itself by fair speeches to

our Protestant people. I shall take occasion next week to allude to the subject of "what takes place between the soul and God at death," with some further quotations from "Father Muller." I wish to give as much from this standard author as your columns will allow. Very truly yours,

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER III.

THAT JARRATT'S DEPOT TRACT.

PETERSBURG, VA., JULY 15, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—Some months ago in a card published in the *Index and Appeal*, (a secular journal of this city) Father Wilson, the Parish Priest of St. Joseph's church, called some of the Protestant ministers of the city to task for "doctrinally misrepresenting" the Roman Catholic Church: "knowing as they did," said he, "the existence of a commandment in the Decalogue which says, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor,' they should not have committed themselves by its palpable violation." One of the specifications under this charge was that we represented the Roman Catholic Church as teaching that there is no salvation outside of its pale. In reference to this he uses the following remarkable language, (see *Index and Appeal*, June 30th, 1879), "No salvation outside the Catholic Church is a doctrine we never held. We say there is no salvation for those who *knowingly* and *willingly*," (the italics are his), "remain outside of the Catholic Church *after being convinced that*

she and she alone is the Church established by Christ." You may judge of my astonishment when I read these words over the signature of a Roman Catholic priest, knowing as I did that the uniform teaching of his church for centuries has been to the contrary, and that upon this ground alone it has sought to justify the extreme severities of fire and sword with which it has striven to force a recantation of heresy. But you cannot imagine my astonishment when I found that in the Parochial school under his own supervision and control a text book was being used, one whole section of which is headed in large capitals, NO SALVATION OUTSIDE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, the aim of which is through more than thirty pages of questions and answers to prove that there is no salvation—not for those who "knowingly and willingly remain outside after being convinced that she and she alone is the Church established by Christ"—but for all, without exception, who die out of the pale of the Roman Catholic Church. This book, which is published and endorsed by the leading authorities in this country of the Catholic Church, after stating, as we have seen in the tract, that no one who dies out of the pale of the Church can be saved, asks, p. 89,

"*Question.* Who are out of the pale of the Roman Catholic Church? *A.* All unbaptized persons, unbelievers, apostates, excommunicated persons, and all heretics." The author then de-

votes one question and answer to each of the four classes first mentioned, but when he comes to the last class—"*Protestants or heretics*"—as he calls them, he occupies sixteen pages in an elaborate effort to prove that they must inevitably be lost unless they renounce Protestantism and become Romanists.

But, you may ask, does not the author draw a distinction between "those who know the Catholic Church to be the only true Church and those who do not?" I answer that he does, but not so as to excuse the latter, but only to make the former "more guilty and damnable." As to the latter class we have the following question and answer:

"*Q.* What are we to think of the salvation of those who are out of the pale of the Church without any fault of theirs, and who never had any opportunity of knowing better?

A. Their inculpable ignorance will not save them; but if they fear God, and live up to their conscience, God in His infinite mercy will furnish them with the necessary means of salvation, even so as to send if needed, an angel to instruct them in the Catholic faith rather than let them perish through inculpable ignorance."

This question plainly refers to the heathen who "never had any opportunity of knowing better," and implies that they are saved only by the adoption of the Catholic faith—and therefore union in heart to the Catholic Church. It does not bear

on the question of the final state of those who die out of the Catholic Church. But the five questions which immediately follow do bear on that point and are as follows:

"*Q.* Is it then right for us to say that one who was not received into the Church before his death is damned?

Q. No.

Q. Why not?

A. Because we cannot know for certain what takes place between God and the soul at the awful moment of death."

This looks as if the author would leave a hope yet for a man who lived and died a Protestant, but the next answer sweeps it all away again.

"*Q.* What do you mean by this?

A. I mean that God in His infinite mercy may enlighten at the hour of death, one who is not yet a Catholic, so that he may *see the truth of the Catholic faith, be truly sorry for his sins, and sincerly desire to die a good Catholic.*

Q. What do we say of those who receive such an extraordinary grace, and die in this manner?

A. We say of them that they die *united at least to the soul of the Catholic Church* and are saved."

In each of the above cases, either by the ministry of an angel in life, or an extraordinary grace in death, the person becomes a Roman Catholic in belief and in spirit—is "united at least to the

soul of the Catholic Church" and therefore is no longer without its pale. Then follows this question:

"*Q.* What then awaits all those who are out of the Catholic Church, and die without having received such an extraordinary grace at the hour of death?

A. Eternal damnation as sure as there is a God."

This is the real teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, not drawn from cards intended for Protestant eyes, but from a catechism expressly prepared for doctrinal instruction in Catholic schools and endorsed by highest Catholic authorities, as "a clear, sound, orthodox exposition of Catholic doctrine." According to this teaching, for the Protestant, however honest, humble, pious he may be, however saintly his life, however triumphant his death, unless at the last moment he renounces Protestantism and becomes a Romanist, there remains nothing but "eternal damnation as sure as there is a God." Whether Protestants think it right to encourage such teaching by contributing to support Catholic churches, I submit as one of the important questions of the hour.

And now, as I wish in my next letter to refer to some matters in a recent sermon of Bishop Keane, I will, before letting the "tract" go by, refer to the subject of the ten commandments. The tract

states that the Roman Catholics strike out one of the commandments from the Decalogue. "Rufus" denies this and says that the Protestants have divided the first commandment into two, and united the ninth and tenth into one. This assertion of his is without a shadow of foundation, is refuted by the very language of the Decalogue, where it will be seen at a glance that what he calls the ninth and tenth commandments is only one—aimed at the one sin of covetousness—"Thou shalt not covet;" whilst the first and second commandments of the Decalogue, as we count them, are really two, aimed at different sins; the first at the worship of false gods, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" and the second at the use of images, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," etc. But if the question was simply as to the division into ten parts, it would not be so serious a matter. What we call attention to is that all that part of the Decalogue which we call the second commandment is *stricken out*. Look at the "Decalogue" as quoted fully in the "tract" from "Father Muller." Where is the commandment—no matter how you number it—which says: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image?" When the catechumen is told to "say the ten commandments," he is taught to say as the first, "Thou shalt have no God but me," and as the second, "Thou shalt not take the

name of the Lord thy God in vain." Not one word about graven images. That is a sore point with the Church of Rome. She feels self-condemned n the presence of that precept and therefore she omits it.*

Very truly yours,

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

---

*The editor of the *Catholic Visitor* in his issue of Feb: 10, 1881, has made this remarkable statement: "Father Muller alone of the authors of Catholic catechisms that we know of, has chosen to give the *substantial meaning* of the first commandment, (of which what Protestants call the second commandment is a part) instead of *its text.*" How unfamiliar he must be with the Catechisms of his church! Here lies before me a "Short Catechism of the Christian Doctrine on the basis adopted by the First Plenary Council of Baltimore," compiled by Bishop Verot, and published by Murphy & Co , of Baltimore. The Decalogue will be found *twice* in this Catechism; just as in Father Muller's, without the slightest reference to graven images. And so in the "Manual of Catholic Piety" published in Philadelphia, and so in almost all the catechisms and books of devotion by Roman Catholic authors that have fallen under my eye.

LETTER III.

ROME AND THE BIBLE.

PETERSBURG, VA., July 22, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—In the synopsis of Bishop Keane's sermon at Jarratt's Depot, which was published in the *Catholic Visitor* of the 3d inst., appear the following words in reference to the Roman Catholic Church, "Her enemies say that she will not let her children read the Word of God, but though often repeated the charge is utterly false. It is but one of the many lies constantly circulated against the Church, of which if even one-half were true, Catholics would be the worst set of people in the world. But they are false. Any one who chooses can test the falseness of the assertion that the Church forbids the Bible to the people. In any Catholic bookstore, the Bible can be procured by any one in the vulgar tongues, in many various editions, published and spread abroad with the approbation of the Pope and bishops. Every Catholic family is expected to have the Bible, and its reading is strongly advised. Yet notwithstanding these patent facts the old slander is daily repeated and often by persons who could know better if they would."

The statement on my part eighteen months ago that the Church of Rome prohibited the free use of the Bible to the laity, drew forth from Bishop Keane a statement in the *Index-Appeal* somewhat similar to the above, and though in reply I gave through the same journal the evidence upon which I based the charge, I heard nothing further from him until being now in the neighborhood of Petersburg, and addressing an audience in large measure of Petersburg people, he refers to the subject again, only to indulge in charges of "lies," "slanders daily repeated," etc. Now I cannot bandy epithets of this kind. I have never been able to see that there is any argument in them. But I repeat my assertion that the Church of Rome prohibits the free use of the Bible by the laity and I bring the proof.

1. The Council of Trent, the last Ecumenical Council save one (the Vatican) of the Church of Rome, placed the Bible in the vulgar tongues on the list of prohibited books. This act being passed by an Ecumenical Council and approved by the Pope, became the supreme law of the Church, binding on all Catholics everywhere throughout the world; and not having been repealed, in so far as I know, by the Vatican Council, the only one having similar jurisdiction, it continues to be the law of the Church; and the Bible, in the common language of the people is, to-day, forbidden by law to the common people except under specified con-

ditions. What those conditions are will appear from the following quotation of the language of the Prohibiting Act. (Canons and Decrees of Council of Trent, Tauchnitz Authorized Edition, Rule III, p. 232.) "Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience, that if the Holy Bible translated into the vulgar tongue be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good, it is on this point referred to the Bishops or Inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety they apprehend will be augmented and not injured thereby, and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers who shall sell or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue to any person not having such written permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subjected by the bishop to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offense. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors." Notice now that by this law, no Catholic layman has a right to buy a Bible, even a "translation by

Catholic authors," without permission of his bishop or inquisitor, and this permission may be given or withheld by the bishop at his pleasure, and the man who has it must have it *in writing*. If I want a Bible then, I must apply to a bishop, (as, thank heaven, we have no inquisitors in this country yet.) If he thinks my piety will be promoted by it he gives me a written permission to use the Bible. Then I can go to a bookseller and buy one. If the bishop refuses, I cannot buy one without forfeiting my right to absolution and subjecting the bookseller to the forfeiture of the value of the book and such other penalties as the bishop may inflict upon him. Is this what you call the free use of the Word of God. You may say the law is not enforced. Bishop Keane says you can go into a Catholic bookstore and buy as many copies as you want. Well, law does not cease to be law because it is not enforced. Bishop Keane may not prohibit the free use of the Bible, but his Church does, and if he is a loyal son of the Church he is bound to do it, to the utmost of his ability.

2. Again the bishop says that "every Catholic family is expected to have the Bible and its reading is strongly advised." It may be true that such is the expectation and advice of Bishop Keane; it is not of his Church. St. Alphonsus Liguori, who stands at the head of all Roman Catholic theologians, who was canonized in 1816 by Pope Pius VII, and whose writings Leo XIII, the present

Pope, has recently commended in the highest terms, not only himself condemns the private reading of the Scripture, but declares that the Council of Toledo in 1239, of Bitterensis, in 1245, and the Councils of Jerusalem, Mechlin, Camaraace, and many others, condemned the translation into the vulgar tongues of the Scriptures for the use of the common people. The Council of Toulouse thus ordained, "We forbid the laity to have the books of the Old and New Testament in the vulgar tongue." Cardinal Bellarmine says that "the people would not only get no good, but much hurt from the Scriptures, for they would easily take occasion of erring both in doctrine of faith and in precepts concerning life and manners." Peter Dens, whose theology is used as a text book in Catholic institutions, says: "This law," referring to the Rule of Prohibition by the Council of Trent, quoted above, "has been received and hitherto kept (with some variation on account of the prevailing spirit of some regions) in by far the greatest part of the Catholic world. More indulgence has been granted only when it was necessary to live among heretics." Additional evidence on this point may be found in a very admirable little work by Rev. Wm. S. Plumer, D. D., entitled, "Rome against the Bible." This work, to which I am indebted for many of the facts stated above, I would cordially commend to all the readers of this letter. I would also commend it to

Bishop Keane. I wonder if, after reading it, he would class the venerable Dr. Plumer among the liars and slanderers of his Church.

3. In the extract given above, Dens, the great Catholic theologian, has told the naked truth. In Catholic countries, such as Italy, Spain and Austria, the rule which prohibits the Bible to all who have not permission in writing is strictly enforced. But in countries like England and the United States, where the free spirit of Protestantism would be in painful contrast with the bigotry and tyranny of such enactments, "more indulgence is granted by the bishops in enforcing the rule," Only let Romanism gain the ascendency here, and the rule will again be enforced, and you and I will have to get written permission from a bishop before we can buy a Catholic version of the Word of God.

Rev. Mr. Seymour, in his "Mornings with the Jesuits," tells us that he went a few years ago—before the present advance of Protestantism in Italy—into every bookselling establishment in the city of Rome to try to purchase a copy of the Holy Scriptures. He says, "I could not procure a single copy in the Roman language and of a portable size in the whole city of Rome; and when I asked each bookseller the reason of his not having so important a volume, I was answered in every instance that the volume was prohibited or not permitted to be sold. Martin's edition was

offered to me in two places, but it was in twenty-four volumes and at a cost of 105 francs"—nearly twenty dollars.

Father Curci, a priest living in Rome and in good repute with the present Pope, says in the preface to a recent edition of the New Testament: "The New Testament is the book of all others least studied and read amongst us. So much so that the bulk of the laity, even of those who believe that they have been instructed, and profess religion, are not aware that such a book exists in the world, and the greater part of the clergy themselves scarcely know more of it than what they are compelled to read in the breviary and missal."

Though the Roman Catholics of the world speak more than sixty languages, which have been reduced to writing, I am sure that that Church has never translated the Bible into one-tenth of them —and yet every "Catholic family," says the bishop, "is expected to have the Bible." How are they to get it when it has never been translated by their own Church, and Protestant translations are not only forbidden but denounced and anathematized in most unmeasured terms.

How, in the face of all this, can Bishop Keane claim that the Catholic Church expects every family to have the Bible, especially when he knows that on the face of the Douay Bible—the approved Catholic translation—under the heading "Admonition," appear the following words: "It

was judged necessary to forbid the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar languages without the *advice* and *permission* of the pastors and spiritual guides whom God has appointed to govern His Church. Nor is this due submission to the Catholic Church to be understood of the ignorant and unlearned only, but also of men accomplished in all kinds of learning."

Here it is then. Even "men accomplished in all kinds of learning" can read the Bible only by permission of their pastors and spiritual guides. In the greater part of the Roman Catholic world this permission cannot be had, and if it could, it would be of no avail, for there is no authorized translation into any language which the layman can read. He can find translations of "The Lives of the Saints," and other books of that kind, but none of the Word of God. Why do they refuse to translate the Bible and anathematize our Bible Societies for doing it, except that they do not wish their people to have the Bible? It would open their eyes—dispel the illusion of immaculate conception, worship of images, prayers to saints, and all such superstitions. It is hard for the Church of Rome to make progress where the Bible is in the hands of the common people.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER IV.

ROME AND THE VIRGIN MARY.

COBB'S ISLAND, VA, July 29' 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—When, on the mount of temptation, the devil bade our Lord fall down and worship him, he received the scathing reply, (Matt. iv: 10,) "Get thee hence Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve." This would seem to settle forever the question of worship, so that none would dare to offer it to the Virgin Mary, or any other creature. But what cares the Roman Catholic Church for the Bible? Does not "Father Muller" tell us that the doctrines of the church are "entirely independent of Scripture." The Bible says, God alone is to be worshipped. The Church of Rome says, God and the Virgin Mary are both to be worshipped. No wonder the Church of Rome dreads the circulalation of the Bible.

But you may ask, Is it not an inferior kind of worship which Catholics are taught to pay to the Virgin Mary, and not really worship in the sense of adoration? I answer that I will simply quote from their own authorities, and then leave you to judge for yourselves.

I have before me several Catholic books of devotion. They were not issued hundreds of years ago, but are of recent date and from the Catholic press in this country. One is entitled *A Manual of Catholic devotions for the use of the faithful who desire to live piously and die happily, published with the approbation of the most reverend the Archbishop of Baltimore. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.*, 1866. This little book contains one hundred prayers to the Virgin Mary. I can only quote one or two. On page 432 is one, "O holy mother of God, glorious queen of heaven and earth, I choose thee this day for my mother and my advocate at the throne of thy Divine Son. Accept the offering I here make of my heart: may it be irrevocable. It can never be out of danger whilst at my disposal; never secure but in thy hands." Page 438, "Remember, O most pious Virgin Mary, that no one ever had recourse to thy protection, implored thy help, or sought thy mediation without obtaining relief. Confiding then in thy goodness and mercy, I cast myself at thy sacred feet, and do most humbly supplicate thee, O mother of the eternal Word, to adopt me as thy child, and take upon thyself the care of my salvation. O let it not be said, my dearest mother, that I have perished where no one ever found but grace and salvation. Amen." Page 595, "Mother of God, mother of mercy, I beseech thee by that cruel sorrow which pierced thy af-

flicted soul when, standing under the cross of thy beloved Son, thou didst see Him die for our salvation, that thou wilt please to be favorable to me both now and at the last period of my mortal life, Permit not, O great comforter of sinners, that it be ever said that thou didst leave a soul in extreme necessity which had recourse to thee but vouchsafe to look on me and all my associates with those eyes of tender passion as then thou didst behold bleeding Jesus when expiring on Mount Calvary, that with thee we may praise Him, the Father and the Holy Ghost for all eternity."

Another of these works is entitled *The Ave Maria. A book of prayers for servants and children of Mary. New York: Thomas Kelly.* 1874. *Imprimatur John, Cardinal McClosky, Archbishop of New York.* Here we read on page 219, "Hail, holy queen, mother of mercy, our life, our sweetness and our hope—to thee we cry, poor banished sons of Eve, to thee we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this valley of tears: turn then most gracious advocate, thy eyes of mercy towards us, and after this our exile is ended shew unto us the blessed fruit of thy womb Jesus. O clement, O pious, O sweet Virgin Mary." And on page 245,

"Sweet Virgin we offer
On suppliant knee
These prayers that the church
Has devoted to thee!
Oh Mary, conduct us
In happiness' way
And at the last hour
Assist us we pray. Amen."

The third book is entitled "*The Pious Guide to Prayer and devotion, calculated to answer the demands of the devout members of the Roman Catholic Church.*" *Baltimore: Lucas Brothers.* 1846. On page 76, in a prayer to the Virgin Mary as "Mother of God," is the following passage, "Pardon my past offences and indignities, pardon those of mankind. Prostrate in like manner before thee, make us sinners as we are, sensible of the favors thou hast conferred upon us, and being truly contrite for the past, may we by thy aid and assistance, breaking the chains of our former thraldom and slavery, live henceforward, in the favor and in the happy liberty of the children of God." In each of these works is a Litany called the Litany of our Lady of Loretto, in which the Virgin Mary is addressed with more than forty titles of reverence—amongst which are the following, viz: "Holy Mother of God, Mother of Divine Grace, Mirror of Justice, Seat of Wisdom, Tower of David, Ark of the Covenant, Gate of Heaven, Morning Star, Refuge of Sinners, Comforter of the Afflicted, Help of Christians, Queen of Angels, etc., etc." What can be said of such worship as this, but that it involves the very highest elements of adoration. It is the offering to a mere creature of the worship which belongs to God alone.

But the most remarkable of all these books is one entitled, *The Glories of Mary, Translated from*

the Italian of St. Alphonsus Liguori, founder of the Congregation of the most Holy Redeemer. First American Edition, James B. Kirker.

The author of this work is the one from whom we quoted last week, who was canonized some fifty odd years ago by Pope Leo XII, and whose writings are commended by the present Pope in the following words, "These writings have been spread throughout the whole world with the greatest profit to the Christian cause, and it is to be wished that they should become still more and more popular and be placed in the hands of all. For with the greatest skill he directed and promoted the moral training of all, and they may be all perused by the faithful without any danger of stumbling."

The edition of this work from which I am enabled to quote has the *imprimatur* of Cardinal McClosky in these words:

"This new and improved translation of 'The Glories of Mary,' having been duly examined is hereby approved of. † John, Archbishop of New York. New York, January 21st, 1852." This book then is sanctioned by the highest authority, and the translation fully endorsed. Let us see what its teachings are.

On page 27, is the following, "The Kingdom of God consisting of justice and mercy, the Lord has divided it: He has reserved the kingdom of justice for Himself, and He has granted the kingdom

of mercy to Mary, ordaining that all the mercies which are dispensed to men should pass through the hands of Mary, and should be bestowed according to her good pleasure."

With this view of Mary as the only source of mercy, this teacher, canonized by Popes and commended by Cardinals, teaches his readers to pray as follows:

Page 88, "Behold, O mother of my God, Mary, my only hope, behold at thy feet a miserable sinner who implores thy mercy. Thou art proclaimed and called by the whole church, and by all the faithful, the refuge of sinners; thou art my refuge; it is thine to save me."

Page 130, "O Mary, we poor sinners know no refuge but thee. Thou art our only hope. To thee we entrust our salvation."

Page 230, "I invoke then thy aid, O my great advocate, my refuge, my hope, and my mother Mary. To thy hands I commit the cause of my eternal salvation. To thee I consign my soul. It was lost but thou must save it."

Page 672, "Thou art the mother of God, the mistress of the world, the queen of heaven. Thou art the dispenser of all graces, the glory of the holy church. Thou art the example of the just, the consolation of the saints, and the source of our salvation. Thou art the joy of paradise, the gate of heaven, the glory of God."

Page 78, "Do not say that thou canst not aid me, for I know that thou art omnipotent, and dost obtain whatever thou desirest from God."

On page 202, the author quotes with approval the declaration of St. Bernardine of Sienna, that "all obey the commands of Mary, even God himself."

Page 327, "Rejoice O mother and handmaid of God, rejoice, rejoice. Thou hast for a debtor him to whom all creatures owe their being. We are all debtors to God, but God is a debtor to thee."

On page 781, appears the following doxology to the Virgin: "O Mother of Jesus our Lord, the love of all men and of God, to thee be honor and blessing with the Father and with the Holy Spirit. Amen."

In a little work before me, to which I shall allude more particularly hereafter, entitled "THE PURGATORIAN CONSOLER," appears the following prayer—a prayer in such high repute at Rome that the Pope offers, as we are told in a note appended, (see pp. 79-80,) "an indulgence of *three hundred days*" as often as the above prayer is recited with a contrite heart, *before a picture or* IMAGE *of the Blessed Virgin.*" What a convenience that the commandment about *graven images* has been stricken out! But here is the prayer, word for word, only the italics being mine: "Most Holy immaculate Virgin, and my Mother Mary, to thee,

who art the mother of my Lord, the Queen of t e world, *the advocate, the hope, the refuge of sinners,* I have recourse to-day, I who am the most miserable of all. I WORSHIP thee, O great Queen, and I thank thee for all the graces which thou hast hitherto granted me, and especially *I thank thee for having* DELIVERED ME FROM HELL, which I have so often deserved. I love thee, most amiable Lady, and for the love which I bear thee, I promise always to serve Thee and to do all that I can that thou mayest also be loved by others. *I place all my hopes in thee*, and I *confide my salvation* to thy care. Accept me for thy servant, and receive me under thy mantle, O Mother of Mercy! And since thou art so powerful with God, do thou *deliver me from all temptations*, or rather obtain me strength to triumph over them until death. Of thee I ask the true love of Jesus Christ; *through thee I hope to die a good death.* My Mother, by the love which thou bearest to God, *I beseech thee to help me* always, but especially at the last moment of my life leave me not until thou seest me safe in heaven BLESSING THEE AND SINGING THY MERCIES FOR ALL ETERNITY. AMEN."

Can any one blame me for warning our Christian people against ascribing to the Virgin Mary the attributes of God, against worshipping her as the "only refuge and hope of sinners," against

binding themselves to "praise her and sing her mercies for all eternity," against rendering to a creature that worship which is due to God alone. It is vain to talk of distinctions between *dulia*, and *latria* and *hyperdulia*. No higher adoration is possible than that which is expressed in the prayers quoted above. Besides there is no authority in Scripture for rendering her any worship, either that of *dulia* or that of *latria*. The latter may be worse than the former, but both are against the plain teaching of Scripture which says, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." They are alike forbidden by that command of the Decalogue which the Church of Rome has suppressed, and which says, "Thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them." They are alike offensive in the sight of a "jealous God," who "will not give His glory to another." They are alike unknown to the practice of the early Church. They are not only aside from the word of God, but contrary to it; to its language, to its spirit, to the very foundation principles upon which all revealed religion rests.

Let Protestants who propose to attend Roman Catholic services, remember that in so doing they publicly endorse this idolatry. They acknowledge and worship in outward form at least Mary as the "Mother of God," the "Queen of Hea-

ven," "The Refuge of sinners," their "only hope," their "Great Advocate," the "source of salvation," the "joy of paradise," the "gate of heaven," "the glory of God," etc.

I do not see how those who join in idolatrous worship of the Virgin now can be less guilty in the sight of God than those who entered the heathen temples and joined in their idolatrous worship in the days of Paul. With the same indignation may we exclaim, "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate."

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER V.

ROME AND THE PRIESTHOOD.

PETERSBURG, VA., Aug. 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—I have been recommended, as you know, in my ignorance of "Catholic doctrine," to become a disciple of the learned "Father Muller," whose teaching has the strongest endorsement of the dignitaries of his Church as being "in the true spirit of St. Alphonsus; its theology sound and solid, its spirit most devout, and its language simple and popular." I have therefore procured a number of the works of this divine, and propose to give you copious extracts from them that your readers may know what are the real doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. The first of these works has the following title page—

THE CATHOLIC PRIEST. *By Michael Muller, C. S. S. R., Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. Baltimore: Published by Kreuzer Brothers, 30 North street. 1876.*

It will be seen that this work is not written by some neophyte, who does not know what his Church teaches; or by some lay-rhapsodist, who in his foolish devotion to the priesthood of his Church indulges in language whose extravagance his own religious teachers would condemn; but,

by a priest, one recommended for his orthodoxy, soundness and *solidity* of doctrine. When he tells us what the position and power of the priesthood is, we may accept it as the authoritative teaching of the Church in which he ministers. Let us then open the book and read some extracts from it.

"Every priest can say in some measure with Jesus Christ who sent him: 'All power is given to me in heaven and earth.'" (Page 70.)

"His power reaches to the highest heavens, it penetrates even to the very gates of hell. Kings have power only over the bodies of men, but the priest has power over their souls. Kings have power only over their subjects, but KINGS AND EMPERORS ARE THEMSELVES SUBJECT TO THE PRIEST. (The italics and capitals, except where otherwise specified, are mine.) Kings have power to open and close the prison gates of earth, but *the priest has power to open and to close the gates of heaven and of hell.*" (Pages 71, 72.)

"The priest has the power to free the sinner from the bonds of sin and hell and to open to him the gates of heaven. He has the power *to transform him from a slave of the devil to a child of God.*" (Page 77.)

"Seek where you will, through heaven and earth, and you will find but one created being who can forgive the sinner, who can free him from the chains of sin and hell, and *that extraordinary being is the* PRIEST, *the Catholic priest.* 'Who can

forgive sins except God?' was the question which the Pharisees sneeringly asked. 'Who can forgive sins?' is the question which the Pharisees of the present day also ask, and *I answer there* IS *a man on earth that can forgive sins and* THAT *man is the Catholic priest.* Yes, beloved brethren, the priest not only *declares* that the sinner is forgiven, but he *really forgives him.* (The italics here are his.) The priest raises his hand, he pronounces the word of absolution, and *in an instant, quick as a flash of light, the chains of hell are burst asunder, and the sinner becomes a child of God.* So great is the power of the priest that THE JUDGMENTS OF HEAVEN ITSELF ARE SUBJECT TO HIS DECISION." (Pages 78, 79.)

It might be supposed that the author really did not mean in this last phrase what it plainly signifies, viz., that God's forgiveness is conditioned upon that of the priest. But his subsequent writings on the same point leave no doubt, as witness the following:

"It is to the priest that God speaks when he says, 'Judge between me and my people.' *Judica inter me et vineam meam.* (Is. V.) 'This man,' says God, speaking to the priest, 'this man is a sinner, he has offended Me grievously. I could judge him Myself, but I leave this judgment *to your decision.* I SHALL FORGIVE HIM AS SOON AS YOU GRANT HIM FORGIVENESS. He is My enemy, but I shall admit him to My friendship as soon as you declare him

worthy. I shall open the gates of heaven to him as soon as *you free him from the chains of sin and hell.*' " (Page 82.)

You may say that the possession of such power as this really makes a God of the priest. Well, our author does not hesitate to claim for himself equality of power with God. He says:

"God has placed on his (the priest's) finger the ring of authority and power. He has given the priest the ALMIGHTY POWER of forgiving sins." (Page 84,)

"To have the power to create new worlds is to partake of God's own omnipotence, but to have the power of forgiving, of destroying sin, IS TO HOLD THE VERY PLACE OF GOD HIMSELF; it is to perform one of the greatest works of God's almighty power." (Page 85.)

This self-exaltation, (for you must remember that it is a priest claiming this power for himself, and not some blind devotee claiming it for him), by which a mere creature arrogates to himself the power and authority of Almighty God is surely sacrilegious enough—but what shall I say of the language that follows, in which this priest declares that in the celebration of the Mass, God Himself becomes subject to the authority and control of the priest?

"The eternal, Omnipotent God, in whose presence the pillars of heaven tremble, that God before whom the earth and all that dwells thereon,

before whom the boundless universe with all its countless suns and planets, before whom all created things are but as a drop of water, as a grain of dust, as if they were not; that God of infinite majesty and glory IS SUBJECT TO THE PRIEST. He instantly descends from heaven IN OBEDIENCE TO THE VOICE OF HIS PRIEST." (Page 95.)

"There is a man who opens at will the gates of heaven, who speaks to the eternal Son of God, and at his voice *the God of heaven descends on earth and* SUBJECTS HIMSELF TO HIS CONTROL." (Page 96.)

"When we see a weak sinful man possessing power over God himself, possessing power to bear Him, to place Him, to give Him to whom he wills, we cannot help exclaiming in amazement, 'O wondrous miracle! O unheard of power!'" (Page 97.)

And when we hear "a weak sinful man" arrogating to himself this power, for which there is not the shade of a shadow of authority in the word of God, we are painfully reminded of that "man of sin" whose coming Paul predicts in his 2d epistle to the Thessalonians, "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

After following this writer thus far, our readers probably think that nothing he can say will be

extravagant enough to surprise them, but there are two or three passages that will even yet startle them. First to be told that Christ did not die to redeem the world but to establish the priesthood will amaze them. And yet here it is:

"So sublime is the dignity of the priesthood that in order to establish it our Lord Jesus Christ had to die. To REDEEM THE WORLD, IT WAS NOT NECESSARY THAT OUR LORD SHOULD DIE. *A single drop of His sacred blood, a* SINGLE TEAR, *a* SINGLE PRAYER *of His would have sufficed; but in order to* ESTABLISH THE PRIESTHOOD *our Lord had to die.* (Page 98.)

And so we are told by this "clear, sound, orthodox" divine that Christ did not die to redeem the world—that He could have redeemed the world with a single tear or a single prayer, but He died to establish the priesthood. I thought the doctrine that Christ died to redeem the world was the foundation of all Christianity. It was the doctrine of Paul, of St. Augustine, of all the fathers. But the Roman Catholic Church is progressive. It has discovered that Christ did not die to redeem the world. Well, what next?

"To forgive sins, to cause the Holy Ghost to dwell in the soul, to change bread and wine into the body of God are miracles that can be performed only by God Himself. Now the priests perform these miracles every day and consequently they *may truly be said to be gods.* And St.

Gregory Nazianzen is right in saying '*the priest is a God on earth* and his mission is to make gods of his fellow men.'" (Page 109.)

A single quotation more as to the honor and obedience which this "sound" and "orthodox" priest claims for himself, and I have done.

"Since God, then, has placed the priest *upon the throne of his own adorable sanctity*," (where does "Father Muller" get this information?) "since He gives to the priest the title 'Saviour of the world,'" (where is this title given?) "since He calls the priest 'His co-operator in the divine work of redemption,'" (where does He so call him?) "what wonder if He commands all to obey and honor the priest as they honor and obey Himself. Since the priest has been so honored by God Himself, what wonder is it that he should be honored by angels and men. St. Francis de Sales saw the guardian angel of a young priest whom he ordained, go in advance to the right of the priest before his ordination; but after his ordination the angel went to the left of the priest and followed him. Wenceslaus, king of Poland, *would not sit down in the presence of a priest.* St. Catharine of Sienna and Mary of Oignies, KISSED THE GROUND ON WHICH A PRIEST HAD WALKED. St. Francis of Assissium said that if he saw an angel from heaven, and a priest, he would *bow first to the priest, and then to the angel,* for the

angel is the friend of God, but *the priest holds His place.*" (Pages. 110, 112.)

Do our American people understand the meaning of all this? Only let this Roman Catholic theory of the priesthood prevail; let this hierarchy that claims for itself equality with God, firmly root itself among us, and the day will come when the sisters and daughters of American freemen, taught to believe that "even God Himself is subject to the priest," will be found "kissing the ground on which a priest has walked;" and the Church, so far from rebuking them for this degrading man-worship, will commend them, and hold them up as examples to others as it has done "St. Catharine of Sienna, and Mary of Oignies." Whenever a woman reaches the point of kissing the ground on which a man has walked, she is already helplessly in his power. She has sacrificed to him her self-respect, which is the guardian of her honor. He may do with her what he will. Painfully enough does the past history of Romanism show how this power has been employed.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER VI.

ROME AND PURGATORY.

PETERSBURG, VA., AUG. 18, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—I have just finished reading a very interesting book of "Father Muller" entitled the "PURGATORIAN CONSOLER,—A MANUAL (as the title page informs us,) "*originally prepared for the use of the members of the Purgatorian Arch-Confraternity, enlarged and adapted to general use by Rev. Michael Muller, C. S. S. R.*" It is published in New York in 1879, by the "Printers to the Apostolic See," and has the *Imprimatur* of the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore. No one then will gainsay its authority. And now if any poor soul is in dread of Purgatory, and seeking for a "*Consoler*," I warn it away from this one, for it will cry out after reading it, as Job did to his friends, "Miserable comforters are ye all."

First, as to the sufferings of Purgatory, the teaching is awful; hell itself could not be worse than the Purgatory here described. Listen to but a single extract: "They (the souls in Purgatory) are buried under waves of fire. It is from the smallest spark of purgatorial fire that they suffer

more intense pains than all the fires of this world put together could produce. In this fire they suffer more than all the pains of distempers, and the most violent diseases; they suffer more than all the most cruel torments undergone by malefactors or invented by the most barbarous tyrants; they suffer more than all the tortures of the martyrs summed up together. Could these poor souls leave the fire of Purgatory, for the most frightful earthly fire, they would as it were, take it for a pleasure garden; they would find a fifty years stay in the hottest earthly fire more endurable than an hour's stay in the fires of Purgatory." Pages 34, 35.)

I could multiply passages—but this is enough. Think of being *buried under waves of fire* of which *one spark* causes more suffering than *all the fires of this world put together* could produce, fire in comparison with which Nebuchadnezzar's furnace was a *pleasure garden.* If that is not hell, only one of Hudibras' celebrated theologians could "learnedly divide" betwixt the two.

But let us ask our author, who are the miserable souls allotted to this awful inconceivable torture? Surely they must be the worst enemies of God! No, says our author:

"The souls in Purgatory are holy souls. They are confirmed in grace and no longer in a condition to offend God, or to forfeit heaven. They love God above every thing. All their disorderly affections

and passions have died away, and as they love God, so are they loved by God in an unutterable manner." (Page 95.)

And this is a description of their condition, not after purification in Purgatory, but on their entrance into it, for the author in another place speaking of the soul of the believer, says:

"No sooner has the soul departed this life than it * * * finds it altogether impossible to wish, to seek, and to love anything but God. It experiences at once an insatiable hunger and thirst after God. It pants for its Supreme Good with a most violent desire. 'God! God! I must be with God!' is its constant cry. But the very moment in which the soul is endeavoring to unite itself to God, *it is repulsed by the Lord*, and sent to Purgatory to expiate for its sins not sufficiently cancelled in this life." (Pages. 30, 31.)

Nothing astonishes us more in reading this work than to find in Purgatory enduring these torments, of which one hour is equal to fifty years, in the hottest flames of earth, the souls of the purest and holiest of those who were saints on earth! Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Canonized saints, monks of "great piety and perfection"—all come back to earth to tell of their merciless torture in these flames. And to see for what trivial offences they suffer such awful penalties! There is for instance "St. Severinus Archbishop of Cologne, a prelate of great sanctity, so much so that God

wrought through him many remarkable miracles." Being found in Purgatory "suffering most excruciating pains," and being asked why he suffered so much, who on account of his holiness of life ought to be reigning gloriously in heaven, he replied: "I suffer this torment merely for having *recited the canonical hours hurriedly and with willful distraction*," (Pages. 20, 21.)

The Emperor Theophilus was there "because he had been unable to perform the penances towards the end of his life *he had wished to perform*." (Page 135.)

A Dominican priest being interviewed, says: "My too great familiarity with seculars and my useless conversations with them were the cause of my long stay in Purgatory." (Page 137.)

A sister of charity had to lie on a bed "the upper and lower parts of which were full of red hot iron points penetrating into the flesh. She told me she had to endure this pain for her carelessness in her observance of the rules." Her tongue was "eaten up by moths on account of uncharitable words, &c." (Pages. 138, 139.)

If such tortures await such pious people what is to become of those of us less devout and holy? And why are they there at all, if they are God's people whom Christ died to redeem? (But I forget that the orthodox author denies that Christ died to redeem them.) Our Saviour said to the thief on the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise."

Why does He "repulse" these holy souls and send them to Purgatory? The author says in the passage quoted "to expiate for their sins not sufficiently cancelled in this life." Well this is strange! I thought Christ died to expiate for the sins of his people. The Apostle says (1 John i: 7) "the blood of Jesus Christ, His son, cleanseth us from all sin." But "Father Muller" says (page 8) that the divine justice has not yet been fully satisfied, and that the soul must be confined till by *suffering* it is cleansed and purged from all the defilements of venial sins, and rendered fit to be admitted to the presence and enjoyment of God. So it seems that Christ's blood only cleanses from *some* sins and not from all, as the inspired apostle imagined! True, "Father Muller" tells us only the "venial sins" remain. But if Christ's blood cleanses from the *mortal* sins I do not see why it should not from the venial too, If it atones for the great ones, why not for the least? And these least must be awful if it requires so much suffering to expiate them. And if Christ's blood has not power to cleanse them, I do not see how Purgatorial fires are to do it And when I read that some of these "holy souls" are "doomed to suffer the pains of Purgatory to the day of the last judgment," (page 23,) and the rest escape only through instrumentalities set on foot by their "brethren on earth"—chief of which are Masses, (page 50), which must be payed for, (page 49 and 105), Father Wilson to the contrary notwithstand-

ing, and to be paid for even if it requires the last dollar. (Page 105): I ask you is not the prospect gloomy enough, especially for those who die in poverty, and leave none "to offer the honoraries of one or more dollars for the 'intentions' of the Masses of a priest in their behalf?" (Page 49).

And now where is the Scripture warrant for this monstrous system which consigns archbishops of great sanctity, pious abbots, canonized saints, etc. to these tortures which fairly make our hair stand on end. The *only* passage cited in its support is that in Matt. xii: 32, about the sin against the Holy Ghost, "which shall not be forgiven neither in this world nor in the world to come," "in which words (says our author) He (Christ) plainly *insinuates* that some sins shall be forgiven in the world to come,"—and now upon this imagined *insinuation* he builds his whole system, saying, "Now this truth *necessarily establishes* a middle state where some sins shall be forgiven." (Page 9.) Was ever so monstrous a hypothesis rested upon so slender a base? Purgatory upon an *insinuation!!* and that one of the *author's own imagining*, for our Lord did not mean to *insinuate* any such thing—but simply to give emphatic statement to the unpardonableness of the sin against the Holy Ghost. I would rather, like Paul, "depart and be with Christ, which is far better," than, like the Archbishop of Cologne, depart and be "buried under waves of fire," which is *far worse.*

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER VII.

ROME AND CHARITY.

PETERSBURG, VA., August 27, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—As my object in these letters is not controversy but the information of your readers concerning the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church as expounded by "Father Muller," I enter to-day on the review of another of "Father Muller's" works. It is entitled "CHARITY FOR THE SOULS IN PURGATORY. *By Michael Muller, C. S. S. R.*," etc., and is published in Boston, under the *imprimatur* of the Bishop of that city.

It contains amongst other matter, most of which is in the work reviewed last week, an account of an association called the *Purgatorian Arch Confraternity*, which has its headquarters—as all these Jesuitic orders of course have—at Rome, and now numbers many hundreds of Sub-Fraternities in this country and in Europe, and numbers its enrolled members by millions. It seems to be a sort of joint stock company, for the purpose of accumulating as large a stock as possible of "masses, prayers, alms-deeds, indulgences," etc., as a fund from which to draw for the relief of souls in Pur-

gatory. It seems to have begun operations with a large advance capital, the Pope having given it to begin with—"no less than thirty-five plenary and over two hundred partial indulgences in the year," (page 143) with the privilege under certain conditions of "an indulgence of forty years and forty quarantines on every day of Lent," (page 154.) Besides, this "the Superiors Generals of the Carmelites, of the Augustinians, of the Trinitarians, of the Franciscans, and of the Capuchins," the great leading Monastic orders of the world, "have affiliated all the members of the Arch-Confraternity as oblates of their respective orders with the privilege of sharing in all the good works which are performed in these orders." (page 157.) It also "shares in a particular manner in all the good works which are performed in the congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer," another mammoth association. Its assets are therefore immense, and being on the mutual benefit plan, they are being increased daily, as each member obligates himself to contribute to the utmost of his ability to the general stock as long as he lives, hoping to draw from it enough when he dies to help him through the fires of Purgatory with dispatch. If the new system of obtaining *masses by lottery* should come into general use, as it doubtless will very soon, we may expect these assets to be increased with great rapidity. Thus a recent number of the Quebec *Morning Chronicle* contained the following advertisement :

"The Lottery for the Rimouski Seminary will be held on the 10th of August next and following days. Tickets one dollar each. Two hundred and fifty prizes. Six hundred masses for the living and the dead will be at the disposal of holders of tickets. Address the secretary of the Bishop of Rimouski. June 16, 1880."

When we remember what Father Muller tells us about the heat of Purgatorial fires, it will be evident that this "Arch-Confraternity" with *masses by lottery*, will be immensely popular, more so than fire insurance companies, or life insurance companies, or any of these institutions. With headquarters at Rome, and a Jesuit as Procurator-General, with its hundreds of confraternities and millions of enrolled members all over the world, it will become a mighty engine in the hands of the Papacy whenever occasion may arise.

But I would call attention more particularly to a "heroic act of charity," which is recommended to its members by this Arch-Confraternity, and which is so remarkable as to deserve more than a passing notice. I quote the act with its heading as it appears on page 165.

Heroic Act of Charity, or Offering of all Works of Satisfaction and Suffrage in behalf of the Souls in Purgatory.

"This heroic act of charity in behalf of the souls in Purgatory, consists in a voluntary offering made to them by any one of the faithful of all

works of satisfaction done by him in this life, as well as all suffrages offered for him after death, he thereby depositing them into the hands of the Blessed Virgin that she may distribute them in behalf of those holy souls whom it is her good pleasure to deliver from the pains of Purgatory."

Well, this does indeed at first blush look like a very heroic act of charity, to sign away with a single stroke of the pen, a man's whole interest for time and eternity in all that can help him through Purgatory, and consent to go there and burn whilst the Virgin Mary releases some favored votary in his stead. It reminds me of that wonderful charity which so charmed the celebrated Duke of Brunswick, and became his crowning reason for becoming a Catholic, namely, that "the Catholics to whom I spake concerning my salvation, assured me that if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the Day of Judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves;" forgetting, poor silly soul, that if he were "damned for embracing the Catholic f ith," they would have to be damned too for the same reason, instead of being damned in his stead; and that, even if such were not the case, the Lord m ght have something to say as to whether that singular case of soul-insurance should be recognized in the courts of heaven. And so here, if there were such a place as Purgatory, I do not think the Lord would pay much re-

gard to this system of bargain and sale, lottery-drawing and raffling in masses for the dead, indulgences, &c., so that a man might very safely bargain to give away his interest in 'Purgatorial consolation' of this character, and not consider it any very heroic act either.

But, looking a little further down I find that the gift after all is not so heroic as it at first appeared; for it is distinctly agreed that in this "heroic act" the man only gives away the "satisfactory part" of his good works, "the meritorious, propitiatory and impetratory parts, which, being personal cannot be communicated, being reserved for ourselves." (page 169.) So then the man only gives away one-fourth and retains three-fourths for himself. And if he could keep all the *meritorious* part of his stock, all the *propitiatory* part and all the *impetratory* part, I should think he could afford to let the *satisfactory* part go. So his "heroic act" already begins to dwarf very much.

But I read a little further: "To make this act is not to lose but to gain. By it you enhance the merit of all your actions, which are in the sight of God so much the more meritorious the greater the charity with which they are performed; nay, to make this act is to increase all your good works and their merit a hundred-fold. What man would hesitate to lend one hundred dollars to his neighbor to free a poor man from his painful captivityr if he knew for certain that a hundred times more

would be returned. This is indeed a rich bargain, he would say, by which I become wealthy at once." (Page 173.)

To make this act then is a good bargain! One that pays well! And the author goes on to show how well it pays, enumerating many advantages, among which are the following: "You put the souls delivered from Purgatory by your prayers under perpetual obligations to yourself. The Blessed Virgin and all the saints of heaven, especially the patron saints of those souls, as well as their guardian angels, will become intercessors for you before the throne of God in a most special manner. Those souls will themselves, from a sense of gratitude, take a particular interest in your welfare both temporal and spiritual, and promote the same by their prayers to the best of their power even whilst detained in Purgatory. You *shall not have to pass through Purgatory*, or at least, *you will not stay there very long*." (Page 181.)

With these guarantees, and especially this last one, I should think almost anybody who believed in Purgatory would jump at the opportunity to make this act. I do not think the confraternity ought to call it *heroic*, unless they mean it in the sense of *mock-heroic*. They certainly ought not to call it an "act of charity." It is a good speculation—a first-rate bargain, but it wants the very first element of charity. An act of charity is one which is gratuitous, which asks and expects no re-

turn—but this one, the very motive to which is that it will pay, and pay well.

And now this brings me in conclusion to say that here is the great fatal defect of the whole Roman Catholic system of charity. I would not undervalue or disparage those great eleemosynary institutions, agencies, and organizations by which the Roman Catholic Church has done so much for the relief of suffering and the mitigation of sorrow. But I claim that the system of good works, merits, indulgences, etc., of the church of Rome divests these inititutions of that element of true charity to which I have referred—and makes them institutions of self-righteousness where men and women work to win merit, to escape Purgatory, and to purchase heaven. The comparisons, therefore, sometimes drawn between Protestantism and Romanism favorable to the latter because of its "splendid charities" are fallacious. Real charity, that which "vaunts not itself," that which gives, not to win heaven, but to relieve distress, that which has no thought of itself or of any return, but only of the misery it is relieving, is the outgrowth of that great principle of Protestantism; "Freely ye have received, freely give."

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER VIII.

ROME AND THE ALTAR.

PETERSBURG, VA., Sept. 3, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—In his sermon at Jarratt's Depot, to which reference has already been made, Bishop Keane used the following language (see synopsis in *Catholic Visitor* of July 3d): "He explained that the altar is erected in every Catholic church for the eucharistic sacrifice, and he called the attention of his hearers to the declaration of St. Paul (Heb. xiii: 10), 'We have an altar, whereof they cannot eat who serve the tabernacle,' and suggested to them when next they would enter a Protestant church to ask: 'Where is the altar?' and if they are told there is none, to compare the fact with St. Paul's assertion: 'We have an altar.' He explained that the crucifix on the altar shows that the sacrifice offered on that altar is the showing

Now, the first question I would like to ask is, Did Bishop K. really mean to teach that when Paul said "we have an altar," he referred to a material altar such as the Roman Catholics now have in their churches? His language will not, it

seems to me, bear any other construction. It was so understood by all his hearers with whom I have conversed. I have no doubt he meant it to be so understood. His advice about Protestant churches could have no significance if he did not. Well, then, taking it for granted that this is his interpretation, that Paul referred to a material altar on which the sacrifice of the Mass was offered, I would like to ask him where he thinks this altar was, for the Apostle only mentions one. You will notice he uses the singular number; he does not say "we have altars," but "we have *an altar*." The *we* evidently refers to the whole Christian Church, and as St. Paul speaks of the whole Church as having a single altar, I would like to know where Bishop K. thinks that altar was. Did it remain at Jerusalem, where, according to the Roman Catholics, "Mass" was first celebrated? Or did Peter carry it with him to Rome? Or did Paul carry it with him on his missionary tour? Did he have it with him when he "thrice suffered shipwreck" Did he still hold on to it when he was "a night and a day in the deep?" And what did Peter and the other Apostles do for an altar whilst Paul was traveling around with that one? Did they have to wait until the one consecrated altar came home before they could say Mass? And must not the poor souls in Purgatory have had a hard time when there was only one altar on which their friends could "offer the honoraries of

one or more dollars for the 'intentions' of the Masses of a priest in their behalf," and Paul had that one away off in Asia Minor, or Spain, or some other remote province of the Roman Empire.

Now I hope the Bishop will not seek to free himself from this embarrassing question in the same illogical way that Archbishop Gibbons does in that very remarkable book of his, "The Faith of our Fathers," where after quoting the words of Paul, "We have an altar," he naively adds, (page 314), "The Apostle here plainly declares that the Christian Church has *its altars* as well as the Jewish synagogue"--which is as complete a *non sequitur* as it would be if I were to quote the Apostle's words a little above, "We have such an High Priest," and then add, "The Apostle here plainly declares that the Christian Church has its high priests as well as the Jewish synagogue." The Jewish synagogue had no altars, as it had no high priests. The *tabernacle* to which Paul refers, (and not to the synagogue), had one sacrificial altar and one high priest, and only one. So the temple had but one altar of propitiating sacrifice and one high priest. And the Apostle means to teach here that as the Jewish Church had but one altar of propitiatory sacrifice, so the Christian Church has but one. But if Bishop Keane's interpretation of this passage is correct, then the Roman Catholic Church must explain how it has come to multiply altars so as to have one or more in every church

edifice. One altar sufficed under the old economy, and the most rigid prohibitions were laid upon the erection or use of more than that one (see Deut. xii: 5-28). St. Paul says we have one under the new dispensation--one for the whole Church. And the whole Church continued to have but one altar of propitiatory sacrifice for several centuries after Christ, until the rise of the Church of Rome. One of the first marks of its defection was the multiplication of altars of propitiatory sacrifice, just as under the old economy, one of the first marks of apostacy was the multiplication of altars of burnt offering in the land. This multiplication has gone forward, until to-day, instead of one altar, as in the days of Paul, we behold ten thousand altars on which ten thousand priests are imagined to be offering each a propitiatory sacrifice every time the Mass is celebrated; for the Council of Trent says (Canon 3 of the Mass): "If any one saith that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice, or that it profits only him who receives it, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be anathema !"

If Paul had been a Roman Catholic he would have said "we have altars;" and when the hearers

of Bishop Keane enter a Protestant church now and ask, "where is the altar?" we tell them, "just where it was in the days of Paul, *in heaven*, where the High Priest is who is *on the right hand of the throne*." But if one of those hearers should ask Bishop Keane where the altar was of which Paul spoke, whether in Jerusalem or Rome or Ephesus, what would he say? Will the Bishop pardon me for asking just one question more? How did he reconcile this interpretation of his with that "public profession of the orthodox faith," which, in obedience to the Bull of Pope Pius IV, (Canon, et Decr. Conc. Trid. Tauchnitz Ed. page 226), he was required to take at his consecration, in which he solemnly made oath, "nor will I ever receive and interpret the the Scriptures except according to the *unanimous consent of the Fathers?*" *nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum.* Now as Pius IV in that Bull warns all concerned that for any one to "go contrary with rash adventure" to this engagement under oath is to "incur the indignation of Almighty God, and the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul," it was reasonably to be supposed that he would first ascertain whether his interpretation was according to the unanimous consent of the fathers--Was it? Well I do not know what Bishop Keane would consider *unanimous consent*, but certainly his interpretation and that of *some* of the fathers is very conflicting---and if only *one* of them differs with him, he brings down the judgment

upon him denounced by the Pope, for a consent is not *unanimous* if *one* voice is lifted against it. Now St. Chrysostom, one of the chief of the fathers, interprets this passage as referring to an altar in heaven. He says in his Homily on the passage, (In Heb. Hom. XI.) "We have our victim above, our priest above, our sacrifice above, therefore we offer such sacrifices as it is possible to offer on that altar," explaining that the sacrifices are *prayer* and *praise*, the only ones that we can offer on an altar in heaven. This breaks up the *unanimous consent* as it seems to me. But further, St. Irenæus, (Adv. Haer. IV, 34,) says, "God wills that we should offer gifts at his altar without ceasing. There is therefore an altar in the heavens, for thither are our prayers and oblations directed." So here is another serious break. Then St. Cyril, of Alexandria, (De Adv. L, 9.) "He (Christ) is the altar, He is the incense, He is the Holy Priest." So well was it understood during the first three centuries of the church, that there is but one altar and that one in the heavens, that the church edifices then, like our Protestant churches now, had no material altars, and it was a standing reproach against the Christians by the Pagans that they had no altars. So that as late as the time of Arnobius the Elder, (A. D. about 300) we have the following declaration, (Arnob. Adv. Gentes,) "You Pagans (Gentes) are accustomed to accuse us of impiety in the highest degree, because we do

not make altars." If they had lived in this day they could have brought this accusation against Protestants, for we now, like Irenæus, and Cyril, and Chrysostom, and Arnobius, have our altar in heaven; but they could never accuse Roman Catholics of not "making altars," since they could say, like the makers of the silver shrines at Ephesus, (Acts xix: 25,) "Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth."

I wonder that the Bishop, with all this array of the Fathers against him, and with the interpretation of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Magnus Apollo of Catholic Doctors, who says, (Expos. in Div. Ap. *in loco*), "This altar is either the cross of Christ on which He was immolated for us, or Christ Himself in whom and by whom we offer our prayers to God;" and that of Lyra, another eminent Catholic expositor, who interprets, "We have an altar, that is the cross on which Christ was offered;" and with the denunciation of Pope Pius IV hanging over his head, should nevertheless have spoken so confidently about the material altar which is wanting in Protestant churches. Would it not have been safer for him, as well as more modest, to have followed the learned Bellarmine, the Coryphoeus among the Jesuit authors, who says, (De Sac. Euch. L. V. Cap 13), "Some grave authors think not improbably that the table of the Lord is expressly called an altar in Heb. xiii; but since there are not wanting Catholic authors who understand

by altar in this passage the cross of Christ, I do not urge it."

And now as Bishop Keane took the liberty of suggesting to his hearers at Jarratt's Depot, most of whom were Protestants, a question for Protestant ministers, I hope he will not decline to answer the questions I have asked him, so that I may transmit to those same Protestants his reply. Will he tell us where that one altar in the days of Paul was kept? and what finally became of it? and why, as one altar sufficed for the whole Church in Paul's day, it is neces ary to have one or more in every church edifice now? and how the Mass was celebrated in the first three centuries of the Church, when it was a standing reproach that the Christians made no altars? and what authorities he can quote better than Aquinas and Lyra and Bellarmine? and what he proposes to do about that "indignation of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul?"

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER IX.

ROME AND FINANCE.

PETERSBURG, VA., October 7, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—On returning from the Council of the Presbyterian Alliance in Philadelphia, I hasten to redeem a promise that my first letter shall contain a correction made at the request of Rev. T. J. Wilson, Roman Catholic priest of this city, who feels that he has been aggrieved by an allusion of mine in a previous letter; and as the correction which he suggests brings up a very important question of finance in the Roman Catholic Church, I think it best to devote this letter exclusively to that subject.

The allusion to which exception has been taken appears in my letter of August 18th entitled, "Rome and Purgatory," in which, speaking of masses and their supposed efficacy in the release of souls from Purgatory, I say, "which (masses) must be paid for, Father Wilson to the contrary notwithstanding."

Now, it might seem a little singular that I should thus draw into this controversy the name of a man who had thus far stood aloof from all public

connection with it. But the explanation will be readily found when I state that this gentleman had been pleased to insert, some months ago, in the *Index and Appeal*, of this city, (a secular journal, and one of wide circulation,) a card over his own signature, accusing a number of Protestant ministers, abstracts of whose sermons had been reported by that journal, of "bearing false witness against the Roman Catholic Church." One of the grounds of this very unneighborly charge was that we represented the priests of his Church as receiving pay for the celebration of the mass; and for our discomfiture he used these words (see *Index and Appeal*, Jan. 30, 1879): "No priest can receive pay for any sacrament, or for offering the holy sacrifice of the mass. This would be a monstrous sin, specifically called Simony, after its first victim, Simon Magus." This was all he said on the point. There was not a word to tone down in any way the force of that solemn declaration, "No priest can receive pay for any sacrament, &c." I was amazed when I read it; and when I mentioned it to an intelligent Protestant of this city, who was formerly a Romanist, his only reply was, "Great heavens! I wish I had back all the money I have paid out of my own pocket for the celebration of the mass." You can readily see, therefore, how it was that when I read in "Father Muller's" books of masses being paid for, this public and sol-

emn assertion of Father Wilson came into mind, and I said, "Father Wilson to the contrary notwithstanding."

Well, what is the correction that my neighbor asks me to make through the *Central Presbyterian?* It is found in these words of his private letter to me, which I quote, that he may be fairly understood—"Now I wish to tell you that I am entitled to, and do receive one dollar, not for the mass, for that would be simony—but for the necessary prerequisites for its due and becoming celebration. Should it be a high mass five dollars are paid for the aforesaid prerequisites, which are correspondingly increased." So the good Father gets the money after all! and I submit to him, if he ought not, in making that solemn testimony of his to convince us of false witness, to have said something about those prerequisites and the pay he got for them. Surely his language implied that he did not get any pay at all, and how could he expect his readers in a secular journal, nearly all of whom were Protestants, to know all about prerequisites and postrequisites, &c. And if I had left out so important a statement, and Dr. O'Connell had come along, oh what a howl we should have had about "the pastor of the Tabb Street Presbyterian Church who could not be trusted to tell the simplest, story even when the reputation of his neighbor is at stake."

But he is clearly entitled to his correction, and in so far as *his* practice is concerned, I accord him

the full weight of it. I admit that he receives money for the "prerequisites" to the due and becoming celebration of the mass. I don't know what those "prerequisites" are. It may be, for aught I know, altogether right that they should be paid for, and I hope he makes good use of the money when he gets it. But now it is very evident that the money to which "Father Muller" refers is not money that is paid for "prerequisites"; very far from it. It is, I quote from his work, PURGATORIAN CONSOLER, page 49, "offering the honoraries of one or more dollars for the '*intentions*' of the masses of a priest in behalf of the souls in Purgatory." The money that is here solicited is not for the prerequisites to the solemnization of the mass, but for the *intentions* of the priest in it—that is for his determination that the efficacy of the mass shall be applied to the relief of the particular souls for whose benefit the money has been paid. Of this supposed efficacy of the mass and the power of the priest by his "intention" to apply it to whom he will, the following incident related by "Father Muller," will best explain—though my pen hesitates to write the words, which upon any proper construction of language cannot be acquitted of the charge of blasphemy. A priest is engaged (PURGATORIAN CONSOLER, page 57,) in offering the mass for the soul of his friend in Purgatory. And this is what is represented as taking place! "When he came to the moment of

consecration, he took the sacred Host in his hands and said, O Holy and Eternal Father, *let us make* AN EXCHANGE! Thou hast the soul of my friend, who is in Purgatory and I have the Body of Thy Son, who is in my hands; well, do Thou deliver my friend, and I offer Thee Thy Son with all the merits of His death and Passion." We stand aghast at the presumption that can claim such power, and propose such barter in the body and blood of God's Eternal Son, but the passage illustrates what is meant by the "intentions" of the mass, and it is for these, not the prerequisites, that these honoraries are solicited and must be paid.

This is evidently the meaning of the author in the passage I referred to in the same connection, as showing that masses must be paid for "even if it requires the last dollar;" for notice the circumstances. (Purgatorian Consoler, page 105.) A poor servant girl has been sick and reduced to extreme poverty. "On the day that she was able to walk about, she had only one dollar left. She prayed fervently that God would assist her, and set out in search of a place. On her way she passed a church and went in to say some prayers. The priest was just about to say mass. The poor girl now remembered that she had forgotten to have the accustomed mass for the poor souls offered up that month, and this was the very day on which she was wont to have a mass said. But how could she have a mass said on that day? She was

sadly in need of the little money she had left. There was a struggle in her heart for a moment. At last her love for souls in Purgatory conquered. 'God will provide,' she said; and she went into the sacristy, gave her little offering to the priest, and requested him to say mass for the souls in Purgatory." You will notice that the priest was about to say mass when she came in, and therefore all prerequisites must have been provided. There was no additional expense incurred by him in saying the mass for the souls in Purgatory. It was a mere matter of "intentions," and intentions cost nobody anything, and yet this girl felt that if the efficacy of the mass should be for the benefit of the souls in Purgatory, that dollar must be paid though it was the last she had.

Now, upon this whole subject I have, in conclusion, but two remarks to make. The first is this: If Father Wilson charges every time he says mass just enough to cover the expense of its celebration, and when he has received from one person enough to cover this expense, declines to receive more, I can see the justice of the distinction he draws, (although he made no allusion to it in his public card, as he ought by all means to have done); but this distinction does not apply to the general usage of his Church, as stated by "Father Muller," where the money is received for the "intentions" of the masses, which is the very essence of them—their inmost core.

My second remark is that this system of receiving money for masses for the dead is an admirable one as a scheme of finance. It has filled the coffers of the Roman Catholic Church to repletion. It has enabled her to build her splendid cathedrals and erect her munificently endowed institutions, and found her ample charities. The anguish of bereaved hearts, terror-stricken with the thought of loved ones writhing in flames which the horrible fancies of men like "Father Muller" have painted, has counted no pecuniary sacrifice too great to secure deliverance from these fiendish tortures—and so the great revenues, of the rich and the scant earnings of the poor have come in to swell the tribute.

But what shall we say of the mercifulness of a scheme, that while it admits the awful, inconceivable torture of these "poor souls," only doles out its masses as they are paid for. Surely if these masses have power to open doors and free tortured souls from Purgatorial fires, every priest in Christendom would stand every day offering freely, offering to the point of utter exhaustion, the masses that have such sovereign power. The fact that they do not, is only another evidence that the whole thing is an illusion of the brain. The Purgatorial fires are as unreal as the masses that quench them—and the only thing real is the good hard coin that comes into the treasury of Rome.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER X.

ROME AND THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

PETERSBURG, VA., November 4, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—I have before me a copy of the *Catholic Visitor* of the 23d ult., with a four column letter from Dr. O'Connell, on the subject of *Dulia* or the invocation of the saints, called forth by some remarks of mine in a preceding letter. He says the object of his letter is to show that the invocation of saints "is based upon the inmost convictions of our nature, supported by the universal testimony of the Church of God, and sanctioned by the SACRED SCRIPTURES." I ask particular attention to this language. What does Dr. O'Connell say this invocation is based upon? Not upon Scripture; not even upon that great basis of which Roman Catholics make so much—the testimony of the Church. He says it is "sanctioned" by the former, and "supported" by the latter, but is "*based upon* the inmost convictions of our nature." What a lame and insecure foundation! one upon which every heresy, however bald, and every superstition, however gross,

has rested its claim. The very fact that he sets to work to establish as the basis of his saint-worship, not the sure testimony of the Word of God, but the subjective convictions of our poor human nature is a proof at the outset of the human origin and superstitious character of that for which he pleads. All his arguments from our "inmost convictions" are utterly worthless. They are mere hay and stubble, not worth the consideration of a moment. Nor can his claim to the support of "the universal testimony of the Church of God" be regarded as of any decisive importance. He has not and cannot have universal testimony. He has no testimony at all from the early and primitive Church, before the corruptions were introduced which culminated in the superstitions of the Church of Rome. The few passages from the early Fathers quoted in defense of the worship of Mary and the saints are, some of them interpolations by later hands, some of them mere rhapsodies; none of them intended by their authors to give any countenance or support to the great system of saint-worship of later days. He has only partial testimony after that period. The purer portions of the Church were never contaminated with that superstition of creature-worship. There were never wanting in the darkest times the seven thousand that did not bow the knee to Baal, and his appeal to the testimony of the Church for support is one which cannot be sustained. But he

says he aims to show that the practice is "sanctioned by the SACRED SCRIPTURES" (the capitals are his own), and now indeed he interests us. When he tells us of Scripture authority we begin to listen with earnestness. If he can prove to us from the Word of God that it is right to pray to angels and saints we shall have not a word more to say. But what are the Scriptural proofs. Leaving out of view one or two references to the Apocryphal books which are not inspired, and therefore are of no authority as a rule of faith and practice, he gives us but two quotations. One is from Gen. xlviii: 16, "The angel that redeemed me from all evil bless the lads," where he says Israel invoked an angel. Well, it is now generally conceded that this angel Jehovah, or Messenger-Jehovah of the old economy to whom Jacob refers, and who was worshipped by Abraham, Manoah, Gideon, etc., was the Second Person of the adorable Trinity, so that this invocation of Jacob is a very good precedent for praying to our Lord, but no precedent at all for offering prayers to any creature. The second passage is that in Rev. v: 8, where the four and twenty elders are spoken of as having "golden vials, full of odors which are the prayers of saints." Now I call attention to the fact that the prayers here are not the prayers *for saints—but the prayers of* saints, that is of God's people still upon the earth, for this is the exclusive use of the word "saints" in Scripture. These

four and twenty elders are simply represented as "having" these prayers, not "offering them up," as Dr. O'Connell says; there is no reference to that either in the Douay or King James version. They have them as sweet odors in a vial which they preserve before the throne—and all that the symbol can be made to teach as a matter of doctrine is that the prayers of God's people on earth are so precious to our Lord that they are like sweet perfumes kept in vials by chosen attendants around his throne. This is great encouragement to us to pray to Christ, but none at all to pray to St. Michael, or the Apostle Peter, or St. Joseph, seeing that not one of them is mentioned as even so much as being present or having one of the vials in his hand.

And now since this is all the warrant from Scripture that our learned friend can find, I would like to ask him a few simple questions.

1. If the invocation of saints is so "good and profitable" a thing as he labors to prove it, how does it come that we have no instance of it in all inspired history? Abraham, and Job, and Jacob, and Moses, and David, and Elijah, and Daniel, were all men of prayer. Their prayers are many of them recorded in full. How is it that they never invoked angel or departed spirit, that they never in all their straits looked for help to any but God alone. Then look at Paul. He is constantly calling upon his brethren to pray for him. In almost every

epistle he invokes their earnest prayers—and yet he never once invokes the prayers of the Virgin Mary, or St. Michael, or St. Stephen. How does the Romanist account for this want in these holy men of those "inmost convictions of our nature" upon which he bases his practice?

2. While Dr. O'Connell was reading the book of Revelation which tells of the "vials of odors," how did he fail to notice those two passages in which John proposed to render worship to an angel and was rebuked with the words, "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant," etc.? (Rev. xix: 10; xxii: 9.) Here is very strong testimony against angel worship, as is also that in Col. ii: 18, where "worshipping of angels" is expressly condemned, as all creature worship is over and over again in other places.

3. How does Dr. O'Connell know that these "saints" whom his Church requires him to worship are in heaven at all. I say *requires*, for there is no option about the matter as his letter would seem to imply. In the "Confiteor," which must be said in order to obtain absolution, the applicant is obliged to say, "I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed Mary ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints," and "I beseech the blessed Mary, ever Virgin, blessed Michael the Archangel," etc., etc., as above —so that he must both confess to all the saints,

and supplicate all the saints before he can receive absolution, and without this absolution he is taught to believe that he will be damned eternally. Now who these "saints" are we are not left to doubt, for the Roman Catholic Church has a regular catalogue of them. No man can decide for himself who is entitled to this honor. He must accept all those, and only those whom the successive Popes have canonized. In the "Litany of the Saints," (queer that Peter and Paul and John did not seem to know anything about a Litany of the Saints!) we are required to pray to a great multitude by name, such as St. Laurence, St. Vincent, St. Fabian, St. Cosmas, St. Damian, St. Dominick, St. Lucy, St. Catharine, St. Agatha, etc., and then "all the holy virgins and widows;" (I wonder why the married women are not included too;) and then to all the saints of God, both men and women. Now I want to know how Dr. O'Connell knows that all these men and women are in heaven. There is St. Lucy for instance, or St. Cosmas, or St. Damian. How do I know that they are in heaven at all, for I never heard of them until I saw their name on this list of saints to be prayed to. And there is "St." Dominick who was the founder of the Inquisition, and "St." Thomas a Becket, who rent England with unhallowed ambition and partizan strife, and "St." Garnet, who hatched the gunpowder treason, and numbers of others of these canonized saints, about whom we very reasona-

bly doubt whether they are in heaven or in hell, and yet we must pray to them or we cannot have absolution.

4. But suppose we know them to be in heaven, what evidence have we that they can hear our prayers? If St. Lucy, for instance, is to hear the prayers of every petitioner who uses the Litany of the Saints, when it is being used at the same hour by millions of devotees, some in America, some in India, some in Africa, some in Siberia, some in Australia, some in the isles of the sea, she must be omniscient. How is she to hear all these cries, and present to God all these prayers? Dr. O'Connell answers: "God could show his elect all these things in the mirror of his own infinity"—that is, God could first hear my prayer, and tell St. Lucy that I am praying to Him, and what my prayer is, and tell her that I want her to present it to Him, and intercede for me; and then St. Lucy can take my prayer as God tells it to her, and tell it back to Him again, and ask Him to grant it. Well that is certainly a very round-about process! I think our Protestant way is much the more direct, to go to the Saviour who is infinite, who knows all from the beginning, who reads to the very bottom of my heart, who is infinitely loving and compassionate, and to ask Him to intercede for me. I know Him. I do not know St. Lucy or St. Catharine or St. Gervase, or St. Protase. They might take interest in my case and they might not. I know

that Jesus will. He is intercessor enough for me.

5. But finally is not all such creature intercession utterly excluded by that passage, 1 Tim. ii: 5, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus"?. It will be seen at a glance that the emphasis in each of these two clauses is upon the word *one*—there is ONE God, to the exclusion of all others. There is ONE Mediator, to the exclusion of all others. If the text forbids having more than one God, it equally forbids having more than one Mediator. It will not answer to say that the saints are mediators only in a subordinate sense. This text excludes them in *any sense*. If a man cannot have another God even in a subordinate sense, he cannot have another mediator even in a subordinate sense, and this whole business of the invocation of saints is convicted of idolatry. T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER XI.

ROME AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

PETERSBURG, VA., Nov. 11, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—There lies before me a work of "Father Muller" entitled, "THE HOLY MASS, THE SACRIFICE FOR THE LIVING AND THE DEAD," the copy of which in my hands is from the "eighth revised edition," not only has the *imprimatur* of Cardinal McCloskey, but has prefaced to this eighth edition several pages of eulogies upon the work from Cardinal McCloskey, the *Catholic World*, the *Catholic Review*, the *New York Tablet*, the *New York Freeman's Journal*, and other authorities high in the Roman Catholic Church, in which it is spoken of with "unqualified commendation," "recommended in the most earnest manner to all the faithful," its publication "hailed with delight as a great God-send," the "crowning effort of the author's faith-inspired genius," "a mine of instruction and edification for the priest and for the layman," "the book for *our times and our country*," "every single page of it worth the price of the volume," etc.

As an exposition and defence of the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, it may be

regarded from these prefatory eulogies as the very ablest that Romanism can present, and it may be well to examine in the light of this new and much vaunted contribution to the literature of the controversy, that strange doctrine of the conversion of bread and wine really and substantially into the body and blood of Christ.

And first, as to the statement of the doctrine, we have great advantage in following so explicit and candid an author. He does not cover up his meaning with words of dubious import, or throw over it any haze of mystery such as we generally find in writers of his class. For instance in speaking of the Mass, he says (page 206) that it "is indeed an unfathomable abyss of the most astounding prodigies," and he then proceeds to tell us what these "astounding prodigies" are. The first, he tells us is, "that as soon as the priest has pronounced the words of consecration over the host and the wine in the chalice, the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are present upon the altar, His body under the appearance of bread, and his blood under the appearance of wine." The second is "that after the words of consecration there remains neither bread nor wine, though the contrary appears to our senses." The third is that after the words of consecration, there remains nothing of the substance of bread and wine, but only the color, smell, taste and other accidents. The fourth is that "the accidents of bread and wine," by which he means the color,

taste, smell, chemical properties, etc., are all present "without being united to anything, because nothing of the substance of bread and wine is any longer there to sustain them, and the body and blood of Jesus Christ which take the place of bread and wine cannot be the subject of these accidents, *i. e.*, of color, taste, smell and the like." The fifth prodigy is that, "not only the body of Christ, but Jesus Christ, true God, and true man, is entire there such as he is in heaven; so that the blood of Christ, his sacred soul and his divinity are conjointly with his body in the host under the species of bread, and his body, his soul and his divinity are conjointly with his blood in the chalice." The sixth and last of these prodigies is "that Jesus Christ is not only whole and entire in each host, whole and entire in the chalice, but he is also whole and entire in each particle of the host, as he is whole and entire in the least species of wine;" so that "when the priest breaks the host or divides the chalice, it is not Christ who is broken or divided; it is the species or appearance of bread and wine which is broken or divided," Christ "remaining always whole and entire without any division, without any corruption in even the least particle."

Here is indeed an "abyss of the most astounding prodigies"—but the most astounding prodigy of all is that any sane man can bring himself to believe all this nonsense. For notice what a man is required to believe.

First, he must believe what is directly contrary to all the testimony of his senses. Here is what his senses all tell him is bread. He places it under the most powerful microscope and examines it and it has every appearance of bread. He subjects it to the most rigid chemical analysis, and he finds every element of bread. He tastes it, smells it, handles it, and every sense testifies that it is bread. He eats it, and it passes as bread through all the processes of digestion and nutrition. And yet he must believe that it is not bread, but human flesh. Now I beg you to mark that this is a case in which the senses are cognizant of their proper objects: and if they can be deceived into the belief that flesh is bread, and that blood is wine, they cannot be trusted to testify about anything, and all the stress laid in our courts of justice upon "eyewitness" is futile, since a man's senses may deceive him upon the simplest of all questions, that of the difference between bread and meat, or between wine and blood. This first prodigy is therefore a monstrous one, and one without a parallel in all nature or redemption—for there is no other case under heaven in which a man is expected to believe what is directly contrary to all the testimony of his senses. He must in many cases believe what is above or beyond the reach of his senses, but never in any case what is directly contrary to them. And it is evident that this doctrine is not of God, for God made our senses to be to us the veracious and

competent witnesses upon whose testimony, carefully obtained and verified, we may build with implicit confidence.

Second, a man must believe what is directly contrary to his reason. The very fundamental principle upon which reason builds is that every property must have some substance in which to inhere. How can it be a property unless there is something of which it is the property. And yet this man distinctly tells us as his "fourth prodigy," that these properties of color, taste, smell, etc., remain without any substance in which they inhere, "without being united to anything." There is whiteness but nothing white—the bread is not white for there is no bread—the body of Christ is not white for flesh is not white. There is taste but nothing that is tasted, and smell but nothing that is smelled, and touch but nothing that is touched. Now once admit that our reason, which testifies that beneath every property there is a substance, can deceive us, and we have no proof of the certainty of anything in this world. What an absurdity to believe that there can be hardness and nothing hard, whiteness and nothing white, sweetness and nothing sweet, and yet this is the absurdity of this doctrine of transubstantiation.

Third, this doctrine is contrary to the very nature of things in holding that the whole body, blood and divinity of our Lord is not only in each wafer, but in every crumb of each wafer. Now

remember that our Lord had a perfect human body with its full measure of warm human blood; and how can all that body and all that blood be found, not figuratively, or symbolically, or representatively, (for this the author says is "blasphemy"), but really and truly in every particle of every wafer that is consecrated all over the world? It is impossible in the nature of things. And since the body is confessedly material, and the blood material, how can they be whole and entire in ten thousand places at the same time. And, last of all, notice that this author gives as his last "prodigy" that when the wafer is divided, "it is not the body of Christ that is divided." What is it then? Not the bread, for there is no bread—what then? Why hear our sagacious author: "it is the species or appearance of bread that is broken or divided." Well, I have heard of a great many breakages and divisions, but this is the first time I ever heard of *an appearance* being subjected to that operation. And when the record was made by the Evangelist that our Lord "having blessed the bread, brake it" our wise "Father" ought to have been behind to whisper, "Nay Matthew, do not say brake *it*, say brake *the appearance* of it."

Here then you have boldly and plainly stated by this author the doctrine of transubstantiation as it is held and taught amongst us. I reserve a consideration of the evidence upon which he bases

his belief in it for a subsequent letter. I call your attention in conclusion to the fact that a Roman Catholic is bound to believe all this upon peril of eternal damnation. The Council of Trent has declared that "if any one denieth that in the sacrament of the most holy eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but saith that he is only there as a sign or in figure or virtue, let him be anathema."

Here then a man is bound under the most awful malediction to believe what is in direct contradiction to the testimony of every one of his senses, what is in palpable violation of the foundation principles of all right reason, what is an impossibility in the very nature of things, and what he cannot therefore believe without giving up all the principles of evidence on which he bases his belief in anything around him or within him.

Such an utter abnegation of reason could be conceivable only on the supposition of a weight of testimony of some other kind overwhelming in its nature. What the testimony is upon which our author in this "crowning effort of his faith-inspired genius" relies, it will be the object of my next letter to show.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER XII.

ROME AND THE REAL PRESENCE.

PETERSBURG, VA., Nov. 24, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—Having in my last letter given your readers the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, as stated by one of its latest and most vaunted expounders, I propose this week to submit the evidence upon which he seeks to commend it to our belief. He has evidently felt the unsatisfactoriness of the old line of argument in his church, which based itself simply upon the declaration "this is My body," and has undertaken to bolster it up with evidence which he hopes will be more convincing. Well might he seek some better evidence than that contained in our Lord's declaration quoted above; for if our Lord meant, when He said "this is My body" that a transubstantiation had taken place, so that what He held in His hands was no longer bread but His body, why of course when He went on and said, "this cup (or chalice, as the Douay has it), is the new testament in My blood," He meant that the metallic substance of the cup had been changed into a.

testament, and that is more transubstantiation than "FatherMuller" bargained for; and yet if there is not necessarily implied a change of the cup into a testament, neither is there of the bread into the body of Christ. But that is not all; "Father Muller" must have his hands full of transubstantiations. For here are numberless other instances exactly parallel, such as "the three branches are three days," (Gen. xl: 12). "The seven kine are seven years," (Gen. xli: 26), "the ten horns are ten kings," (Dan. vii: 24). "The field is the world," (Matt. xiii: 38). "That rock was Christ," (1 Cor. x: 4). "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candle-sticks are the seven churches," (Rev. i: 20). "The seven heads are seven mountains," (Rev. xvii: 9). Now unless "Father Muller" is prepared to defend Transubstantiation in all these cases, he cannot defend it in the one first named, If we translate in all these cases *signify*, or *represent*, we must also translate "this signifies my body," or "represents my body," and the Transubstantiation myth is at an end. Strange that sensible people should be so blinded when they have this constant usage of Scripture before their eyes. "Father Muller" evidently feels all this, and so he proceeds to give us, by way of further evidence, what he calls "some wonderful manifestations of the real presence." Having driven from the witness-stand the senses of sight, touch, etc., and those dicta of reason upon which

all our knowledge rests, he proposes to introduce to us some witnesses of his own to prove the fact of the real presence. I cannot go through the mass of visions, dreams, portents, omens, etc., by which the faith of credulous and superstitious devotees has been supposed to receive confirmation. I select for my readers three of the witnesses as the ones upon whose testimony most stress seems to be laid. The first is a witness whose testimony is found on page 84, of the book we have been examining (THE HOLY MASS). The Calvinists having proven incorrigible in their disbelief of the real presence, the Lord, says "Father Muller," designs to send them a witness, whose testimony shall be overwhelming, and so sends them—would you believe it—the devil. He enters into a girl, *Nicola Aubry*. Poor girl, his treatment of her is shameful! Witness only one phase of the long diabolical possession. "Her limbs cracked as if they would break. The fifteen strong men who held her could scarcely keep her back. They staggered from side to side—they were covered with perspiration. The mouth of Nicola was wide open. Her tongue hung down below her chin. Her face was shockingly swollen and distorted. Her color changed from yellow to green, and became even gray and blue, so that she no longer looked like a human being. It was rather the face of a hideous incarnate demon."

He is exorcised by the Bishop in the presence, of course, as the story has it, of a gaping crowd of Calvinists, and in the course of the exorcism the following is gravely narrated by our sound, solid and orthodox divine:

"The Bishop read the gospels, prayers, and exorcisms, burned Beelzebub's name, showed him the relic of the Holy Cross and solemnly commanded him to depart. The devil answered impudently that he did not feel like going yet. 'I shall not ask thee any longer,' said the Bishop, 'when thou intendest to leave. I will expel thee instantly by the power of the living God, and by the precious body and blood of Jesus Christ here in the sacrament of the altar.' 'Ha, yes!' shrieked the demon; I confess, that the Son of God is here really and truly present. He is my Lord and Master. It tortures me to confess it but I am forced to do so.' Then he repeated several times with a wild, unearthly howl, 'yes it is true. I must confess it. I am forced to leave by the power of God's body here present. I must, I must depart. * * * I shall go, but I shall not go empty-handed. By the sacred blood I will have my booty. I shall take along with me the head of the little bailiff of Virvins; perhaps I could also take with me some of my Calvinists, body and soul, for they belong to me. He! give me your head,' cried he, tcrning to the Bishop, 'let me see whether I cannot carry it off,'" etc., etc.

Now no one I suppose will question the competence of this witness. The devil certainly knows whether or not the bread is still bread and the wine still wine. He is thoroughly competent. But what shall we say of his veracity? Would his testimony be received in any of our courts of justice? Suppose there were a trial in process, and it should be proposed to put Satan on the stand and take his testimony, what does "Father Muller" think it would be worth? And when the "father of lies" says the body of Christ was really present, that only makes it the more absolutely certain that it was not. So we will let Satan step down, if you please, and we will call for the next.

The next witness is—a mule. His testimony will be found on page 115. A devout soul named Bovillus, having his doubts about the real presence, "St. Anthony" proposes to have his mule, which is probably an old and experienced one, settle the matter for him. His proposition is to starve the mule for three days, doubtless to spiritualize him as much as possible, and then bring him to the "saint" who is to put food on one side and the host on the other, and if the animal approaches the host first, Bovillus is to accept it as evidence of the real presence. At the time appointed, and when a crowd was gathered, "St. Anthony" holding in his hands the blessed sacrament spoke thus: "In the name of my Creator, whom I am not worthy to hold in my hands, I command thee to

draw near and prostrate thyself before thy God—to give due honor to Him, that the heretics may learn from thee how they ought to worship their God in the blessed sacrament.' And behold! no sooner had 'St. Anthony' uttered these words than the mule left his food, went before the blessed sacrament and bowed his head to the ground as if to adore it. At this sight Bovillus, and his whole family, together with many other heretics, were converted and professed their faith in the real presence." Now really "Father Muller" must excuse me if I cannot follow the illustrious example of this Bovillus, and, even upon the high authority of a mule, "profess faith in the real presence." Not that I doubt the veracity of the mule. He had no motive to deceive. He was honest enough; but I doubt his competence to testify. And since I have seen these "educated hogs" telling the time of day, and calculating the age of visitors who had merely given the date of their birth, I am afraid good, honest Bovillus had run against an "educated mule," and was as badly taken in as the honest countryman in Richmond, who, at the State fair, consented to play a game of cards with an educated hog, and whom I afterwards overheard telling some of his comrades that "a fellow don't mind losing his half-dollar so much, but what hurts him is being beat by a hog."

The third witness is one upon whose testimony I can make no comment. Were the subject not so sacred, there is room for mirth over the spectacle of a man with jaws extended trying to perform

the feat of the celebrated giant whose statue is at the fountain in Berne. I forbear all comment. I give you the testimony as it is found on page 191. "A holy man was one day at Mass which was being said by a priest who was rather worldly. What was his surprise at the moment of communion to see a charming child surrounded by luminous rays, reposing on the paten in place of the species of bread! He was more astonished afterwards, for he saw that when the priest went to take communion, the child turned away his head, struggling with his hands and feet, as if to prevent the priest from receiving him into his mouth."

And now, my friends, I ask you, what are we to think of a man who, here in America, and in this 19th century, expects us to receive as religious instruction such stuff as this? And what are we to think of a denomination that through its highest authorities commends a book which contains such stuff as the "crowning effort of the author's faith-inspired genius," "every page of it worth the price of the whole volume," etc? What pity we must feel for the poor deluded peasantry of this church who, in their ignorance, unable to study the Scriptures for themselves, and forbidden to do so even if they are able, look helplessly up to their priests for instruction and are fed upon such husks as this book contains! God pity them, and bring them from under the incubus of such a gross and grovelling superstition! T. D. WITHERSPOON.

THE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary
RICHMOND, VA.

LETTER XIII.

ROME AND THE "SACRED HOST."

PETERSBURG, VA., Dec. 3, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,— Our "sound," "solid," "orthodox" friend, "Father Muller," in that work of his which is "the crowning effort of his faith-inspired genius," gives some marvellous instances of the miraculous preservation of the consecrated wafer, or "Sacred Host," as the Romanists denominate it. The narratives to which I refer represent the "holy host" as thrown into the mire, but still appearing, to the surprise of all, "luminous, and sending forth rays of brilliant light;" as remaining "unconsumed and suspended in the air" after a conflagration in which the ciborium, altar, table, etc., had been reduced to ashes; as being found still "retaining its natural appearance after being buried for a month," etc.

There is one of these instances so remarkable that I take the liberty of inserting it as found on page 232 of "The Holy Mass." A Jew, who of course did not believe in the real presence, having obtained a consecrated wafer, proposed to test the reality of the act of transubstantiation. He therefore stuck the wafer with his pen-knife,

THE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary
RICHMOND, VA.

whereupon "blood immediately flowed from it in abundance." This would have seemed enough to convince even a Jew, but we are told he went on to drive nails into it and pierce it with a lance in mimicry of the crucifixion. Not satisfied then, though "the Host shed blood anew" each time, he threw it into the fire and "it was seen flying here and there without receiving any injury." "The infernal rage that animated the Jew led him to throw it into a pot of boiling water; the water took the color of blood," etc. A woman, hearing of this through the little child of the Jew, went in to see it, and the host "came to repose in the little vessel which the woman had in her hand. All amazed, she carried her treasure religiously to the church of St. Jean-en-Greve. Information was given to the magistrate. The Jew, no wise sorry for his fault, was *condemned to be burned alive*, but his wife, his children, and many other Jews were converted."

Now there are many things at which I marvel in connection with this story. The first is that this Jew was so hard to convince. If "Father Muller" will bring me one of those wafers that contains only the "species or appearance of bread," and stick a pen-knife into it and cause blood to flow freely from it, after I have examined it by microscopic and chemical tests to show that "the accidents are those of bread only," I will believe in transubstantiation, and so would any sane man in the

world; and he must pardon me for believing either that this nameless Jew was stark mad, or that the history of this event, which is supposed to have taken place more than six hundred years ago is not so "authentic" as the learned author declares it. Another thing at which I marvel is the coolness and apparent satisfaction with which our author records the fact that this poor deluded wretch was "burned alive." It seems to me that this was a poor way of convincing him of the truth of the real presence. I don't so much wonder that "his wife and children, and many other Jews were converted," if the alternative was, as seems most likely, that they must either be "converted" or share the fate of the husband and father. And one serious objection I have always had to the Roman Catholic Church is, that, not content with anathematizing those who do not believe in the real presence, where she has had the power she has always been very much given to burning them. But what I marvel at most in these reported instances of the miraculous preservation of the "Sacred Host" is that they should be any matter of marvel to Roman Catholics themselves. "Father Muller" introduces them as if they were something very wonderful; something altogether out of the line of what we would ordinarily expect. I wonder at this, for if the Host is indeed the body of our Lord, if it contains "the whole Christ, body, and blood, soul and divinity," then how can it be oth-

erwise than indestructible. If Christ in his whole personality, human and divine, is in the wafer and in every crumb of it, the wonder is that he should allow himself to be thrown into the mire, and not that he should be "luminous" while lying in it. The marvel is that he should consent to lie buried in the ground for a month, and not that he should "retain his natural appearance."

Indeed it has always been a matter of wonder to me that whilst Romanists profess such implicit faith in the real presence of Christ in the "Host," they should act towards it as if they had no faith in it at all. Look, for instance, at the rules in the "Missal" in reference to the accidents which may occur in the celebration of the Mass, and you find such provisions as the following, for the guidance of the officiating priest: "If the consecrated host disappear either by accident, or by the wind, or by a miracle, or by having been eaten by any animal, and cannot be found, then let another host be consecrated." Now if the Romish doctrine be true there remains in that host after consecration nothing but Christ—"our Lord, body, soul, and divinity." Can then our Lord be blown away, body, soul, and divinity, by a wind? Can he be eaten, body, soul, and divinity, by an animal? And so again. "If a spider or a fly, or something else have fallen into the chalice before consecration, let him throw the wine into a suitable place, and place other wine in the chalice; let

him mix a little water, offer it as above, and continue the Mass. If a fly or something of this kind have fallen after consecration, and nausea arise in the priest, let him take it out and wash it with wine; at the end of the Mass, let him burn it, and let the combustion and lotion of this kind be thrown into the sacrarium. But if he has no nausea, nor fear of any danger, let him take it with the blood." Now, not to dwell for a moment on the revolting features of this swallowing by the priest of the unfortunate spider or fly; or to appear in any way to subject what others regard as sacred to ridicule; I ask this question: If the Roman Catholic really believes, as he professes to believe, that in "the very least particle of wine Christ is completely present, body, soul, and divinity," how can he dare to throw the poor spider or fly into the fire, to whose body, notwithstanding the "washing with wine," there must be still adhering some particle of the fluid into which he originally fell, so that the priest throws Christ in his bodily presence into the flames! Again we read: "If in winter the blood be congealed in the chalice, let the chalice be wrapped in warm cloths; if this does not succeed, let it be placed in hot water near the altar, provided it does not enter into the chalice, until it be melted." Now consider for a moment what it is that is frozen. Not the wine, for there is no wine according to "Father Muller," and all others who accept the

Council of Trent. What is frozen? The rubric says "the blood"—the blood of Christ frozen! But not only the blood—in every particle of the contents of the chalice "the whole Christ is bodily present." So then it is Christ that is frozen! It is our Lord who must be wrapped in warm cloths, placed in hot water, and melted! For certainly something is frozen, unless we are to conclude with "Father Muller" that as it was the *appearance* of bread that was broken, so it is the *appearance* of wine that is frozen! Again, "if through carelessness some of the blood of Christ have fallen—if indeed on the earth or on the board, let it be *licked with the tongue*, and let the place itself be scraped as much as is sufficient, and let what has been scraped off *be burned*, and let the ashes be laid up in the sacrarium. But if it have fallen on the stone of the altar, let the priest *suck up* the drop, and let the place be well washed," etc. Now I ask again, can the Romanist who believes that Christ is really present in every particle of the fluid that has fallen, consent that this licking, scraping, burning, etc., of His dear sacred body shall be performed as the rubric requires? Finally, "if the priest *vomit forth* the eucharist, if the species appear entire, let them be reverently *taken* (*i. e.*, eaten again) unless nausea arise. In that case let the consecrated species be carefully separated, and let them be replaced in some sacred place until they *are corrupted*, and afterwards let them be

thrown into the sacrarium." But if the species do not appear, let the vomit be burned and the ashes thrown into the sacrarium." Nowthink for a moment what it is, or rather *who* it is that, according to this fiction of the real presence, is thus represented as being eaten, vomited, and then eaten again. Can those who treat the consecrated wafer in this way really believe with the Council of Trent "that same God to be present therein of whom the Eternal Father, when introducing Him into the world, says: 'And let all the angels of God worship Him?" And if there is "no more bread nor wine but Christ alone, true God as well as true man, present in it," then how can the corruption take place of which the Missal speaks? Can the immortal body of Christ see corruption? Can the flesh and blood of our Lord be putrid? And if not, what does the Missal mean, unless forsooth, it is the *appearance* again that putrifies? But the strangest of all the tenets connected with this myth of the real presence, is that which holds that our Lord ate his own body and drank his own blood in the first institution of the Lord's Supper. Thus "Father Muller" says, (Holy Mass, page 139), "the body of Jesus Christ was then in the host, and His blood in the chalice. * * * Our Lord then deposited the holy victim upon the table, placing it there in the state of a sacrifice, and offering it to His Father in a mystic and unbloody manner. To complete the sacrifice by a kind of mystic death—

the loss of his sacramental life—He *partook of it Himself*, and then commanded the apostles to partake of it also," etc.; so that here our Lord is actually represented as sitting down in His own bodily presence, visible to the eyes of His disciples, and yet holding Himself, body, soul, and divinity, in His own hands, breaking Himself, eating Himself, and giving Himself to His disciples to eat. And they are represented as consciously eating and swallowing Him, whilst He is sitting and conversing with them as He had done a hundred times before. Can anything be more absurd? And all this is simply because our Lord said, "This is My body," just as He had said, "I am the vine," "I am the door," etc., or just as one walking through Capitol Square in Richmond would say, pointing to the statues as he passed, "this is Stonewall Jackson," "this is Washington," "this is Chief Justice Marshall," etc. How wicked in the Council of Trent to say "if any man says the host is not to be solemnly borne about in procession and presented publicly to the people for adoration, let him be anathema."

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER XIV.

ROME AND THE "SACRED CUP."

PETERSBURG, VA., Dec. 15, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—I have been greatly surprised to find that in the two long and elaborate treatises of "Father Muller" on the Mass, one of which covers 650 pages, and the other 320, there is no attempt to explain the strange custom of his church in withholding from the communicants in the Sacrament that "Sacred Cup" which, as he tells us, contains the blood of Christ for the redemption of the world. I am the more surprised because he holds, what many writers of his church are not bold enough to avow, that when our Lord said "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and Drank his blood, ye have no life in you," He had direct reference to the sacramental eating of His flesh under the appearance of bread, and of His blood under the appearance of wine, and meant to teach that without such communion in the sacrifice of the Mass there can be no inheritance of eternal life. Now surely if the cup is to be withheld from us which contains the blood that we must drink in order to be saved, the author might have

devoted a few of those multitudinous pages to a statement of the reason for refusing us so invaluable a blessing.

I find too that in describing the first communion, at which our Lord presided, and which was intended to be a pattern for all succeeding ones, he not only admits that all the communicants partook of the cup, but adds these portentous words, (Holy Mass, page 39.) "It was the will of Jesus that from that moment forward, *all* His poor creatures, should *everywhere freely* eat His flesh, and *drink His blood*, to make them holy before God." And yet the will of Jesus, it seems, is not his will, for every time he administers the Sacrament he withholds from all Christ's poor creatures present, *except himself*, that cup which he declares to contain the blood which they are to drink to make them holy before God. Surely he might have made *some* explanation of such an act of deprivation which he practices every time he administers the Sacrament.

This omission of his has led me into an investigation of the subject which has developed the following strange facts.

First. The Roman Catholics admit that in all four of the inspired records which are given of the original institution of the Lord's Supper, it is distinctly stated that the cup was given to all the communicants. Matthew says, "He took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them." Mark says, "He took the cup and when He had given thanks He

gave it to them." Luke says not only that He took bread and brake and gave to them, but "likewise also the cup." Paul says, "After the same manner also He took the cup, saying, this do ye as often as ye drink it in remembrance of Me." And yet the Roman Catholic priest takes the cup and blesses it and *drinks of it himself* and then puts it away, and refuses to let a single communicant taste of it. Nor will it answer to say that the apostles were all priests, and therefore Christ gave to them; for in the first place they were not priests—and in the second place the Romish Church does not give the cup *even to priests* when they are present as communicants. Only the *officiating* priest is permitted to partake of the chalice. They have therefore utterly departed from the practice of our Lord and His apostles.

Second. Not only have we thus the example of Christ, we have also, as the Roman Catholics admit, His express command, "Drink ye all of it," (Matt. xxvi: 27) and the assurance (Mark xiv: 23), that in obedience to this command "they all drank of it." And it is remarkable that the word *all* is introduced in speaking of the cup. "Drink ye ALL of it." "They ALL drank of it," as if our Lord foresaw that some such mutilation of the Sacrament would be proposed, and desired to guard His people against it. Nor will it answer to say, as Romanists do, that since the body and blood are both in the wafer, our Lord's command is obeyed in giving

that. They well know that it was *the cup*, and not the bread to which our Lord referred when He said, "Drink ye all of it," that very cup which they now in plain disobedience to His divine command withhold from His people. What is contained under the wafer must be *eaten;* it cannot be *drunk.* So that they give the people of God *nothing* to drink. Christ said, "Drink ye ALL of it." Rome says, "Drink ye NONE of it." Half the Sacrament they have taken away. They give their people only a *half-Sacrament* at the most.

Third. The Apostle Paul who was addressing not priests, but Christian people, joins "eating the bread" and "drinking the cup," so as to show that they are inseparably joined in the communion. "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till He come." "But let a man examine himself and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup," etc. These words clearly show that communion in one kind is as binding as in the other; that both are essential to the integrity of the communion; that the omission of either one invalidates the whole service, and that thus a communion administered in only one, is not simply a half-Sacrament, it is *no Sacrament at all!*

Fourth. This custom is utterly at variance with the whole usage of the early Church. Cardinal Bona, an eminent Romanist, admits, (Rer. Liturg. II, 18,) that "the faithful always, and in all places,

from the first beginnings of the Church till the twelfth century, were used to communicate under the species both of bread and wine," and the most voluminous testimony could be brought, if necessary, to confirm this declaration.

Fifth. The Council of Constance which in 1415, first by law established the usage which now forbids the cup to all except the officiating clergyman, confesses in the very decree of prohibition that this action is in the face of our Lord's example, of apostolic usage, and of the customs of the primitive Church. Its language is, "*Although* Christ did after supper institute this holy Sacrament and administered it to His disciples *in both kinds*, yet NOTWITHSTANDING THIS, the laudable authority of the sacred canons, etc., and *although* this Sacrament was received by the faithful *in both kinds in the primitive Church*, the Holy Council decrees," etc., the substance of the decree being that the contrary usage is henceforth to be law; any persons who maintain it to be sacrilegious or unlawful are to be condemned—and if they persist, *punished by the Inquisition as heretics;* while any priest who dares to follow Christ's example, and obey Christ's command, and conform to apostolic and primitive usage is to be *excommunicated*, and handed over to the secular power *to be burned.* Nor was this any idle threat, for when Huss and Jerome of Prague, raised their voice against this innovation they were very summarily brought to

the stake and burned, as were many others less distinguished than they.

And this decree of the Council of Constance is to-day the law of the Church, having never been revoked, so that all who persist in obeying the command of Christ, "Drink ye all of it," are condemned to excommunication and inquisitorial fires.

Sixth. Although this infallible Council has so decreed, yet "infallible" Popes have time and again "defined" just as strongly against this half-communion which gives only the bread to the people and reserves the wine for the priest.—Pope Leo the Great (Hom. XLI) says of the "half-sacrament" people of his day: "They receive Christ's body with unworthy mouth, but utterly refuse to quaff the blood of our redemption, therefore we give notice to you, holy ones, that such men, whose sacrilegious deceit has been discovered, are to be *expelled from the fellowship of the saints.*." Pope Gelasius I. in a letter to some of his bishops (Corp. Jur. Can. Decret. III: II: 12) says: "We have ascertained that certain persons, having received a portion of the Sacred Body alone, abstain from partaking of the chalice of the Sacred Blood. Let such persons without doubt either receive the Sacrament in its entirety or be expelled from the entire Sacrament, because the division of one and the same mystery cannot take place *without great sacrilege.*" The Council of Clermont in 1095, (Pope Urban II. presiding) decreed as its 28th

canon, that "no one shall communicate at the altar unless he receive the body and blood *separately and alike*, unless by way of necessity and for caution."

I leave Romanists to settle which of these conflicting Popes and Councils was "infallible." The question which will arise at once is, what reason does the Church of Rome assign for this high-handed act in withholding the cup from the laity? Surely there must have been grave reasons for such an innovation; what were they? The Council of Constance says, "for fear of the blood being spilled in transmission of the cup"! Well, I really don't think that being spilled is half as bad as being "licked up," and "scraped up," and "burned," for which the commands of the Church are given in the "Rubrics of the Mass." There must be some reason back of that. I wish "Father Muller" had not been so silent on this point. I would like to know how he can possibly call that a Sacrament which is only half a Sacrament, or can say, "drink ye *none* of it," where Christ says, "drink ye *all* of it." I wonder that Roman Catholics can rest content under this priestly domination which, in order to monopolise the wine, alters the Sacrament, disregards Christ's example, disobeys His express command, renounces the practice of the Apostles, and departs from the usage of the early Church.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER XV.

ROME AND SACRED HISTORY.

PETERSBURG, VA., Dec. 22, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—Nothing will astonish one unacquainted with the genius of Romanism more than the coolness and quietness with which Scripture narratives are embellished, exaggerated, and interpolated to suit the fancy of the writer, without a single word to intimate to the reader that he has passed from the realm of fact to that of romance, or that what he is reading as inspired history is the sheer coinage of the author's fancy, or the day-dream of some old mystic whose legends have been canonized by the Church.

Let us take just a single instance from this work of "Father Muller's," "The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass," which has such high encomiums from the dignitaries of the Romish Church. He has a chapter on "The Mass as a renewal of Christ's passion," and in this connection gives a

detailed history of His trial and crucifixion. Now certainly if there is any place in all history where we have a right to demand that a historian shall confine himself in statements of fact to the records, and where our whole nature should rise in revolt against any exaggeration of the facts in the case, or any interpolation into the record of facts that never existed, it is in this sorrowful history of the crucifixion of our Lord. And yet let any reader take the ghastly, sickening, horrible details, painted by the morbid imagination of this writer, and contrast them with the tender reserve of the sacred writers, and his indignation will scarcely know any bounds.

Let me give you a single quotation from the narrative of our Lord's arrest and trial:

"The soldiers who had witnessed or heard of Christ's miracles, thinking Him a magician, feared lest He should escape from their hands; therefore they bound strongly His sides, arms, and neck with two long ropes and a heavy chain which had been used to open and close the prison-gate. At the end of this chain were manacles wherewith they fastened His hands behind. After binding Him thus cruelly they set out from Mount Olivet with great noise and tumult, some dragging Him forward, others backward, so that He was cast violently to the ground. They vented their rage by inflicting blows upon His face, head, and body. They tore His garments, plucked His beard, drag-

ged Him by the hair, and forced the points of their sticks into His sides, struck Him on His shoulders, and dragged Him from one side of the street to the other. The Lord fell many times striking His face against the ground with great pain, having His hands chained behind His back, His divine face becoming covered with wounds. * * * They conducted Him to the tribunal of Annas. It was there that Jesus received on His virginal face that cruel blow from the ungrateful, barbarous hand of the servant whose ear He had miraculously restored in the garden of Gethsemane. So cruel was this blow that it broke all His teeth, and caused the blood to flow profusely from His eyes, nose and mouth. Sometime after midnight it was decided by the Council that they would retire to rest, Jesus should be thrown, bound as He was, into a dungeon used for great robbers and murderers, so obscure that scarcely a ray of light could penetrate its darkness, and so loathsome as to be insupportable. Thither they dragged the Son of God by cords and chains with which they had bound Him in the garden. Then they chained Him in such a manner that He could neither lie nor sit. * * * For the scourging they chose six young men, remarkable for their strength and barbarous cruelty. They led Jesus into the court, where there was a pillar, and removed the handcuffs, chains, and cords. They tore off His garments, leaving Him almost entirely naked. So

tightly was He bound to the pillar that the cords entered into the flesh, and His divine hands became much swollen. Afterwards they began to scourge Him, two at a time, with a cruelty of which mere human ferocity was not capable; but Lucifer had entered into the hearts of the executioners. The first two scourged the innocent Jesus with large twisted cords, exerting their utmost violence and greatest fury upon Him. The first blow that fell upon His delicate body inflicted large livid bruises, which swelled to a frightful extent, and seemed as if the blood was about to burst from them. When these cruel men were exhausted from fatigue they were succeeded by the second two, who using heavy leather thongs, broke the flesh of the bruises inflicted by the first, so that the precious blood not only covered the body of Jesus, but also saturated the garments of the sacrilegious murderers and fell upon the ground. When exhausted they were succeeded by a third party, who used as their instruments of torture the sinews of beasts which were very hard and dry, resembling dried twigs. Their blows being repeated over the wounds inflicted by the first and second executioners, caused Jesus the most intense agony. But as His body was become one entire wound, they could no longer inflict new wounds; their blows therefore, falling on His sacred flesh, tore out pieces which fell to the ground, and in many places left the bones exposed to

sight. Not content with this, they satiated their cruelty by striking Him on the face, hands, and feet, sparing no part of His body. So bruised, torn, and disfigured was the countenance of the Lord as to be no longer recognizable." (Pages 216—219.)

I will not harrow the minds of my readers with the account of the mockery and of the crowning with thorns, of which last, as this veracious writer informs us, (p. 219), "many penetrated the bones of the head, others came out at His ears and eyes." My pen refuses to copy the sickening details of the crucifixion—the stretching of the body along the cross with ropes until "all the bones were entirely dislocated, and dragged out of place;" the driving and the *clinching* of the nails; the lifting of the cross with the Divine Sufferer upon it, and the letting fall into the hole that had been prepared to receive it, etc. I have surely given you enough!

And now, I ask, are we not rightly called *Protestants*, when we protest against such corruption of Scripture history as this? Cannot the Roman Catholic Church be content with all that mass of superstitious legends and wondrous prodigies that make up its "Lives of the Saints," and let the life of our Lord remain in that grandeur and inimitable beauty in which the inspired writers have portrayed it? Are we to be accused of uncharitableness because we expose and oppose such

wanton and flagrant trifling with the most sacred facts of our Lord's history as this? Can we be expected to recognize as a true Church of Christ, a Church that cannot write even a history of the crucifixion without interpolating as facts its own fancies, and thus exposing itself to the malediction upon those who "add to the things which are written in this book?" If this is the way it writes sacred history, what is its ecclesiastical history worth?

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER XVI.

ROME AND "SEPARATED BRETHREN."

PETERSBURG, VA., Dec. 29, 1880.

Messrs. Editors,—You doubtless remember how severe Dr. O'Connell was upon me some weeks ago, charging me with insulting the good people of Virginia because I said that certain forms and expressions in the Roman Catholic Manuals are idolatrous, and declaring—good charitable man that he is—that he is "wholly unable to attribute such to any lady or gentleman of Virginia." You may remember also how unfavorably to myself he drew the comparison between Bishop Keane and me, saying that "Bishop Keane's regard for the convictions of others in his address is testified to by the secular press of Virginia; Dr. Witherspoon's pulpit is the rostrum of bigotry in Petersburg." Now I am pleased to believe that in the main Bishop Keane's allusions to Protestants in his public addresses are very courteous and charitable. Speaking to mixed audiences of Romanists and Protestants, he is, as I am told, accustomed to speak of the latter as "our separated brethren," to declare his confidence in the honesty of their con-

victions, the sincerity of their desire to serve God, and the earnest though misguided efforts they are making to attain to everlasting life. It is true that once in a while, by way of a little variety, he undertakes to animadvert upon certain ministers in Petersburg, and then waxes just a little warm, using such mild phrases as "lies," "slanders," "calumnies," etc., but that is only when we pin him up too closely about that Canon of the Council of Trent which forbids the free use of the Scriptures, and then, being unable to answer with arguments, he has resort to that other method so customary in his Church. Besides it must be borne in mind that these Protestants of whom he speaks so lovingly are present, and he is speaking to their faces, while those ministers, of whom he speaks so severely, are absent and he is speaking behind their backs, and that makes a great difference. And then again those Protestants of whom he speaks so lovingly are the ones so charitably disposed towards the Roman Catholic Church that they think it a great shame for any one to point out its errors; whilst the ministers towards whom he uses such harsh words are the men who dare to warn the people against those doctrines of the priesthood, and the mass, and the worship of saints, which Roman Catholic writers are so zealously disseminating amongst us.

Now I am an admirer and an advocate of true charity—that which has regard for the person of

an opponent but not for his errors. I have the utmost charity for the members of the Roman Catholic Church ; I have never written or spoken a word which I thought inconsistent with it. But I have no charity for the errors of the Roman Catholic system. I believe them to be dangerous and deadly, and for this reason I lift up my voice against them like a trumpet.

But what I complain of is, that whilst the Roman Catholics, when speaking face to face with Protestants, are so charitable and loving, they are so uncharitable and unloving in what they write when they are behind their backs. Here is "Father Muller" for instance, this so much lauded mouth-piece of the Roman Catholic Church in this country. I have already called attention to the fact that in his catechisms—catechisms in use in the seminaries amongst us, patronized by Protestant parents—the child is taught to say that "Protestants make liars of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, and of the holy apostles," and that they will "have their portion with Lucifer in hell who first rebelled against Christ, and who is the father of liars." And I respectfully submit that it is not exactly the thing for an honest man to do, to go around the State talking so lovingly of "our separated brethren, honest but misguided," and all the time be secretly stabbing their characters in the dark, by teaching in the parochial schools under his control such tenets as these of "Father Muller," No. 3.

But this is not by any means the only instance of this kind of teaching. In this book, "The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass," so earnestly commended to all the faithful, and every page declared to be worth the price of the whole volume, occur two passages to which I deem it due to call the attention of those "separated brethren" who may be disposed to look with favor upon the Bishop's loving advances.

The first of these passages has reference to the order of Free Masons, many of the honored representatives of which are among those "separated brethren" towards whom the good Bishop is so gracious. The passage will be found on page 618. Speaking of certain "pious confraternities" of the middle ages from which, as he says, Freemasonry took its rise, he adds, "They have been succeeded by the so called Free Masons—those *diabolical confraternities, whose object is to destroy all belief in God, and to assist the devil to regain dominion over mankind.*" I commend this language to the notice of such of our Christian men as are members of the Masonic fraternity. This is the declaration of a man living in the city of Baltimore, in the midst of American Freemasonry, a declaration endorsed by the highest authorities of the Romish Church in this country!

But it is not only Free-Masons, but Protestants generally, of whom the author gives us the true estimate held by the church which he represents.

Take the following as an example: On page 492 of the work we are quoting, the author in treating of the consequences of giving up the doctrine of the mass, says of Protestants (and his language applies to *all* Protestants, since all have given up the mass), "For this reason it is that Protestants are so completely absorbed in temporal interests, in the things that fall under their senses, that their whole life is materialism put in action. *Lucre is the sole object on which their eyes are constantly fixed.* A burning thirst to realize some profit, great or small, absorbs all their faculties—the whole energy of their being. They never pursue anything with ardor but riches and enjoyments. God, the soul, a future life—*they believe in none of them*, or rather they *never think about them* at all. If they ever take up a moral or a religious book or go to a meeting-house, it is *only by way of amusement—to pass the time away.* It is a less serious operation than *smoking a pipe, or drinking a cup of tea.* If you speak to them about the foundations of faith, of the principles of Christianity, of the importance of salvation, the certainty of a life beyond the grave—all these truths which so powerfully impress a mind susceptible of religious feeling,—they listen with a certain pleasure, for *it amuses them and piques their curiosity.* In their opinion all this is 'true, fine, grand.' They deplore the blindness of men who attach themselves to the perishable goods of this world: perhaps they will even give

utterance to some fine sentences on the happiness of knowing the true God, of serving Him, and of meriting by this means the reward of eternal life. They simply *never think of religion at all;* they like very well to talk about it; but it is as of a thing not made for them—a thing with which *personally they have nothing to do.* This indifference they carry so far—religious sensibility is *so entirely withered or dead* within them—that they *care not a straw whether a doctrine is true or false, good or bad.* Religion is to them simply a fashion which those may follow who have a taste for it," &c.

These are the sentiments of a man living in Baltimore! This is his estimate of the Protestants of that city and of the country in which he dwells! Was there ever such a libel upon a great Christian people! Lucre their only object! no belief in God, the soul, or a future life! Their religious exercises only a pastime, less serious than smoking a pipe! Religion, a thing of which they never think at all, and with which they have nothing to do! Religious sensibility so entirely dead that they do not care a straw whether a doctrine is true or false, good or bad! I would recommend to Bishop Keane that as he goes through the State speaking so lovingly to his "separated brethren," he would take this book of Father Muller's in his pocket, and read these passages to the Protestants who come to hear him, as the latest exposition of the charitable sentiments of the Roman Catholic

Church towards those outside its folds. And I would recommend those "separated brethren," if there are, as Dr. O'Connell asserts, any who think there is "no occasion for any outcry," to compare these defamatory utterances, intended only for Catholic eyes, with the carefully guarded compliments, intended for Protestant ears, and be warned in time of the true animus of the Roman Catholic Church towards Protestants; for, since "religion is to them (us) simply a matter of fashion," the Roman Catholic Church, once in power, will set itself to work, as of old, to change the fashion, with the Inquisition as chief mantua-maker.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER XVII.

ROME AND MORALS.

PREFATORY NOTE.—In the original issue of this letter in the Central Presbyterian, there occured, through a clerical error, several inaccuracies of translation, which led to a long rejoinder from Bishop Keane in a subsequent number of the same journal, The length of his article, and of the reply which it necessitated, would swell this little volume to undue proportions. I am therefore obliged, though reluctantly, to omit the whole controversy, simply making correction of the clerical errors referred to, so that the quotations as given below are both authentic and accurate. Should any unfavorable criticism be awakened by this course, or any dissatisfaction be expressed by Bishop Keane or others, I am ready to make it the occasion of a separate treatise, in which the controversy between Bishop K. and myself shall appear in its orginal form and as the basis of a full discussion of the whole subject of "Catholic Moral Theology."

PETERSBURG, Va, Jan. 5, 1881.

Messrs. Editors, — In that remarkable catechism of "Father Muller's" to which I have so often referred, and which, be it always remembered, is a text book in the Roman Catholic seminaries to which Protestant parents are thoughtless enough to send their children, there will be found on page 70, the following question and answer:

"Q. Does the Lord make use of apostate Catholics, such as Martin Luther, Calvin, John Knox, and Henry VIII, King of England, to reform the manners of the people?

A. The thought is absurd. The lives of those men were evil, and it is only the devil that makes use of them to pervert the people still more. The Lord makes use of His saints, such as a St. Francis of Assisium, a St. Dominick, a St. Ignatius, a St. Alphonsus, to convert the people and reform their evil manners by explaining to them the truths of the faith, the commandments, and the necessity of receiving the sacraments with proper dispositions, and by setting them in their own lives the loftiest example of faith, purity, and all Christian virtues."

Now when we recall the fact that "St. Dominick," one of these proposed reformers, was the founder of the Inquisition, that mon ster of treachery and cruelty; and that "St. Ignatius," another of them, was the founder of the Order of Jesuits, the greatest curse that Europe has ever had, we can form some idea of what the author's view of "reformation of evil manners" must be.

But I happen to have on my table, through the courtesy of the Librarian at Hampden Sidney College, a copy of the published works of one of these "Saints" whom "the Lord makes use of to convert the people, and reform their evil manners." I refer to the last named of the four reformers above, "St. Alphonsus Liguori." He may at this time, I suppose, be regarded as the highest authority on morals in the Roman Church. He has not only been canonized as a "Saint," which implies

that there is no error in his writings, but he has also been raised to the rank of a "Doctor of the Church," which implies that "his teaching is to guide Bishops and clergy in forming their judgments on difficult cases, and to be a standard whereby they themselves are to be judged." Moreover, a new edition of his works has recently been brought out at Paris, translated into French by approved Catholic divines: and the present Pope, Leo XIII, has accompanied the publication with a letter addressed to the translators, (to which I have alluded in a previous article), expressing his high approval of their labors, and declaring among other things that "with the greatest skill he (St. Alphonsus) directed and promoted the moral training of all, so that his writings may be all perused by the faithful without any danger of stumbling."

Here then is one of the men who, as representatives of Roman Catholic morals, are to reform the evil manners of the people. It is certainly of vital importance for us to know what kind of doctrines and precepts will be taught to our people, if the Roman Catholics should be able—as they are striving so hard to do—to substitute their teachings for those of the ethical writers now in vogue amongst us. We open then this copy of the "Moral Theology" of Alphonsus, which is in the original Latin, and was printed in Paris in

1845, under the immediate supervision of P. Mich. Heilig, Priest and Professor.

Out of the great mass of casuistic questions and decisions, let us note a few, and those not by any means the worst, because there are many, especially under the seventh (or, as he calls it the sixth) commandment of the Decalogue, that are too indecent to be quoted.

But here are, first on the subject of the observance of the ninth commandment, such decisions as these:

"A confessor may affirm even with an oath that he does not know of a sin heard in confession, secretly understanding that he knows it as a minister of Christ, but not as a man." (Lib. IV, N. 153).

"An accused person, or a witness, unlawfully interrogated by the judge, may swear that he is ignorant of a crime of which in fact he knows, secretly understanding that he does not know it so as to be questioned about it, or to make deposition concerning it." (Ib. N. 154.)

"An accused person if in danger of capital punishment, or lifelong imprisonment, or exile, or the loss of all his property, or sentence to galleys, or the like, may deny a crime even upon oath, at least without great sin." (Ib. N. 156.)

"A poor man having concealed goods for his support may answer to the judge that he has none." (Ib. N. 158.)

"A guest, when asked if the food is good may answer that it is, even when it is in fact insipid, mentally reserving to himself that it is good for mortification." (Ib. N. 160.)

"A servant ordered to say that his master is not at home, when he really is, may say 'he is not here,' with the mental reservation 'in this doorway,' or 'in this window,' (where the servant happens to be standing.) He may also say 'he has gone out, 'secretly understanding' on some previous occasion.'" (Ib. N. 165.)

"A wife, asked by her husband if she has committed adultery, may answer equivocally that she has not broken her marriage vow, since the vow still remains in force; or if she has made confession sacramentally of the adultery, she may answer, 'I am innocent of this crime' since by confession it has been taken away." (Ib. N. 162.)

"He who has sworn to a judge that he will speak what he knows, is not bound to reveal secrets, "(occulta.)" (Ib. N. 183.)

"A man may swear to something false, adding however in an undertone the true circumstances of the case, provided the addition in an undertone can be perceived by the other party, though its meaning be not perceived."

Liguori asks the question whether one who swears without the intention of binding himself is under an obligation to keep his oath; and answers in the negative, giving the following as his

reasons: "Such an oath is not a true oath, both because it wants the necessary condition to the nature of a promissory oath, such as is the intention of binding one's self, and because an oath follows the nature of the promise which it confirms, as is certain from Busenbaum. But a promise without such an intention is not indeed a promise, but a mere purpose: therefore the promise being evanescent, the oath is also such, and is considered as made without the intention of swearing, which certainly as we have seen is null and void. But if no oath exists, there is no obligation of fulfilling that oath." (Ib. N. 172.)

Let us suppose for a moment that this system of morals should prevail in this country, this system of equivocation, mental reservation, and suppression of the truth and what would become of our courts of justice? and what faith would there be between man and man? If a man who swears to do a thing and at the same time secretly purposes not to bind himself to do it, is under no obligation to keep his oath: if a man may swear to a false statement by adding *sotto voce*, the circumstances which materially change the statement and remove its falsehood, of what conceivable value will affidavits, and testimony before courts, &c., be?

Take next the subject of theft and hear Liguori on that:

"It is certain that one in extreme want may steal (surripere,) the property of another to satisfy his necessity." (Ib. N. 519.) And in this case the author tells us "the obligation to make restitution is not only suspended, but is also extinguished by the consumption of what has thus been taken." Not only so but a "nobleman who is ashamed to beg or work, may steal to supply his wants if he is poor." (Ib. N. 529.)

"A domestic servant may, according to his own judgment compensate himself for his own labor, if he judges that he deserves greater wages than he receives." (Ib. N. 621.)

This Roman casuist tells us in the same connection that the compensation need not be in the same kind in which the salary is paid; that while the servant ought first to seek redress by law, yet the omission of this is only to be reckoned a venial sin; and that the servant's own judgment as to the value of his services is to be his guide in determining how much of the property of his master he will secretly appropriate to himself.

Now suppose for a moment that this part of Liguori's system was introduced, and that every servant in our households, and that every clerk in our stores should act upon it. There are very few employees upon wages, and very few officials upon salaries who do not "certainly judge" their services far greater than the remuneration they eceive. What a time we should have if each one

helped himself secretly to enough to make up this very high estimate he is pleased to put upon his services!

Let me detain you with a few decisions more, those relating to crimes against the 6th and 7th commandments.

"A servant, through fear of death or some *great loss*, (explained elsewhere as 'being treated badly by his master, looked upon with disfavor, or expelled from the house,') may put his shoulders under his master, or carry a ladder for him to ascend in order to commit fornication, or may even open the door by force and do other things of the same kind." (Lib. III. N. 66.)

If one man murder another in order that a third party may be suspected of the murder and so suffer loss, the real murderer is not under any obligation to make compensation to the supposed murderer for the loss he has sustained. (Lib. IV. N. 586.)

If an ecclesiastic be caught in adultery by the husband, and being involved in an altercation kill the husband, he incurs "irregularity" (that is incapability of holding a benefice or discharging any of the sacred functions,) only in case that he went openly or rashly at a time when the invasion of the husband was to be expected; but if he went secretly and with due caution (*clam et cum debita cautela ne a marito inveniatur,*) then

e does not incur "irregularity." It does not seem to have entered the head of this moralist that the adultery itself was enough to work "irregularity" without any nice questions as to the higher or lower degrees of manslaughter or murder involved in the case.

Such, Christian friends, is the system of morals which Pope Leo XIII, "Father Muller," Cardinal McClosky, &c., would substitute for our present code. Let those who think there is little difference between Protestantism and Romanism ponder these facts. Let us not be considered uncharitable when we cry out against a system which proposes for us in this 19th century, and this American country, such a code of morals as that represented by "St. Dominick," "St. Ignatius," and "St. Alphonsus." T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER XVIII.

ROME AND THE CONFESSIONAL

PETERSBURG, VA., Feb. 24, 1881.

Messrs. Editors,—A friend has laid upon my table a most remarkable book. It is entitled, "THE PRIEST, THE WOMAN, AND THE CONFESSIONAL." It is written by "Father Chiniquy" a priest converted from Romanism, and is issued by "A. Craig & Co., Publishers, Chicago, Ill." I say it is a most remarkable book, for while we have, every now and then, what purport to be the revelations of converted monks, and escaped nuns, filling us with horror at the recital of deeds of darkness within walls consecrated to religion; yet we seldom have the testimony of one so competent to serve as a witness and apparently so trustworthy in all respects.

As to the competency of "Father Chiniquy" to testify there can be no doubt. Born in a Roman Catholic community in Canada; of Roman Catholic parents and ancestry; thoroughly educated in Roman Catholic schools, with a view to the priesthood—he was ordained a priest in 1833, and continued for twenty-three years in the priesthood, being in high repute both amongst the hierarchy

and the common people of his church, receiving many distinguished marks of honor for his labors in the cause of temperance, and enjoying the fullest confidence of all with whom he was associated. Such a man must know whereof he affirms. If any one is competent to tell us of the nature, influence, and fruits of the Confessional, he is.

But what shall we say of his trustworthiness? Can his statements be relied upon? Well, I must say that, while the facts recorded in his book are such that it is inexpressibly painful to believe them, and it would be a great relief if their impression could be shaken off as one would some hideous nightmare, yet the more the case is examined the more does the honesty of the witness impress itself upon you. For up to the time when he left the Church of Rome, no one seems to have stood higher for personal integrity and virtue than he. Those nearly fifty years of unblemished reputation are certainly greatly in his favor. Then the circumstances of his conversion to Protestantism are such as favor the honesty and ingenuousness of the man. No mercenary motive could have influenced him. He had every thing to lose in a worldly point of view, and nothing to gain by his renunciation of Romanism. He had been honored with the important mission of planting a large colony of Roman Catholics in Illinois. He was meeting with remarkable success, when, through contact with Protestantism, he became convinced of his er-

ror, and at once renounced the system in which he had been trained from infancy, and gave himself to the work of a Protestant Evangelist.

His narrative bears the marks of truth upon it. On page 64 he says: "I am now more than seventy-one years old, and in a short time I shall be in my grave. I shall have to give an account of what I now say. Well, it is in the presence of my great Judge, with my tomb before my eyes that I declare to the world, etc."—going on with revelations which it is not my purpose to spread upon these pages. The picture he paints is horrible. He corroborates his own statements by the published statements of others, eye-witnesses like himself. A touching feature of the work is the "declaration" made to the Lord Bishop of Montreal, signed by forty-nine respectable ladies of that city, protesting from personal experience against what they term "the abominations of the confessional," a declaration which closes with these words, "As for us, daughters and wives of Montreal, who have known by experience the filth of the confessional, we cannot sufficiently bless God for having shown us the error of our ways in teaching us that it is not at the feet of a man as weak and as sinful as ourselves, but at the feet of Christ alone that we must seek salvation."

In the appendix to the work the author has quotted in the original Latin of Dens, Liguori, and others, many of the subjects on which the confessor

is required to question his female penitents, and these subjects are disgusting and loathsome beyond expression. It is impossible to see how a man can address such questions to any woman, even the most depraved in the world, or how any woman can listen to them, much less answer them, without utterly forfeiting all self-respect.

It will be seen from what I have said that this work is not suitable for promiscuous reading. It was not published with that design. It ought not to be in the hands of our women, nor indeed of the young people of either sex. But it ought to be read by every husband and father in the land.

The necessity for the publication of such works is a painful one; but the evils against which they warn are so great that the necessity is imperative. My advice to the ministers, church officers, and laymen, under whose eyes these lines may fall, would be to purchase the book, which is a small and inexpensive one, to read it carefully, and then either keep it under lock and key or commit it to the flames.

This whole system of "auricular confession" is so utterly without foundation in Scripture, as well as without precedent in the early Church; it is so susceptible of abuse, however wisely it might be administered; and it is, as "Father Chiniquy" conclusively shows, so fatally adjusted under the direction of Dens, Liguori, and others, to endanger the purity both of confessor and penitent,

that it seems amazing that it should be tolerated in the Church of Rome. The explanation given by "Father Chiniquy" is the only one that seems adequate: viz., that it is through the confessional that the priesthood gain that tremendous power over the consciences of their votaries by which they are able to maintain their supremacy in the face of advancing civilization and Scriptural enlightenment. May God hasten the day when all the victims of this man-made delusion shall, like those Catholic "daughters and wives of Montreal," be brought to see that "it is not at the feet of a man, as weak and as sinful as ourselves, but at the feet of Christ alone we must seek salvation."

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER XIX.

ROME AND RELICS.

PETERSBURG, VA., March 29, 1881.

Messrs. Editors,—Some months ago, at the funeral of the venerable Dr. Plumer in Richmond, Dr. Hoge quoted the words of the Psalmist, "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints," and then added, "precious also in the sight of the Lord is the *dust* of His saints." In the next issue of the *Catholic Visitor* the editor quoted the remark of Dr. Hoge as to the preciousness of the dust of God's saints, and then added, "this" (I quote substantially) "is the reason of the veneration which the Catholic Church pays to the relics of saints."

These two statements, that of Dr. Hoge and that of the *Catholic Visitor*, thus brought into juxtaposition, naturally suggest some thoughts as to the difference between the veneration paid by Protestants to the remains of God's saints who have departed this life, and that paid by Roman Catholics.

As Protestants we give great veneration to the bodies of God's sleeping saints, though it is not of the same kind with that paid by Roman Catholics. Ours is a tender, loving regard, tinged with a feel-

ing of reverence for structures which the Holy Ghost has been pleased to inhabit as His temple, and which, though destined for a time to return to their kindred dust, will one day, under the power of this inhabiting Spirit, be rehabilitated, and fitted in incorruptible and fadeless beauty to become the dwelling places of glorified spirits forever. The Roman Catholic worships this sleeping dust as truly as the Chinaman worships the spirits of his departed ancestors or the Hindoo his idol gods. For while in theory the highest form of worship—that of adoration—is to be paid only to a few relics, such as the wood of the true cross, the nails and other instruments of crucifixion, the crucifixes and other effigies of our Saviour in wood or metal or stone (Th. Aquinas Summ. iii: 25, 3 and 4); yet in fact, as any one who has visited a Roman Catholic country has but too plainly witnessed, these subtle distinctions of *latria* and *dulia* are practically broken down, and the poor devotee before the shrine which contains the skull of some mediæval saint, bends the knee and offers a devotion that belongs of right to the worship of God alone.

But it is not my purpose to discuss at length the difference in the *nature* of the veneration paid, though that is world-wide—the reverence paid by the Protestant being Scriptural and wholesome—the worship paid by the Romanist being superstitious and degrading. I wish rather to call attention

to the different *manner of expressing* this veneration in the two cases. And for this purpose the incident commented upon by the *Catholic Visitor*—the burial of the revered and lamented Dr. Plumer—furnishes a most admirable illustration on the Protestant side.

A great man in our Protestant ranks had fallen. After a saintly life, filled to its full measure of more than three-score years and ten with labor and with honor, this grand old patriarch had gathered his feet upon his bed, and had given up the ghost, as we might conceive Abraham or Jacob or Job to have done. Then, when solemn and impressive religious services had been held, and hundreds had looked not with tearful eyes upon the face which once beheld could never be forgotten, devout men lifted the bier which contained his mortal remains and bore them silently, solemnly, reverently out to beautiful Hollywood. There, in one of the loveliest of all earth's cemeteries, by the side of the beloved wife—the almost lifelong companion—with uncovered heads and with tearful eyes we laid the sacred body in the ground, to sleep undisturbed in its quiet repose until the morning of the resurrection. Thither fresh flowers, the emblems of the resurrection, are constantly borne. There reverently tread the feet of those who loved and honored him in life, who revere and love his memory, now that he is gone. May the turf that is above his head never

be broken. May the sanctity of his tomb never be invaded. Palsied be the arm that would disturb the sacred shrine where, under the guardianship of the Holy Spirit, the dust is returning to the dust as it was. There we laid him: there may he lie in the arms of eternal love, and upon the pillow of immortal hope, until the trumpet shall sound, and he shall come forth to meet his glorified Lord in the air.

I turn now to the Roman Catholic method of expressing veneration for the dust of God's saints. And the editor of the *Visitor* will not object, I am sure, to my looking forward to the honors which his Church may yet have in store for him. Let me suppose, what is not at all impossible, that, through the promotion of prelates that are now over him, and his own promotion to the vacancies which are thus created, he should rise in due time to be, first, Bishop of Richmond, then Archbishop of Baltimore, then Metropolitan or Cardinal with residence in New York. These eminent positions, with the distinguished services rendered in them, would entitle him, we may hope, to that rare distinction in the Roman Catholic Church, though it is the birthright of every humble believer in the Protestant Church—that of being *a saint*. But, as he cannot by the law of his Church become a saint for all his distinguished services until he has been dead one hundred years, and as a saint without relics would be like "the play of Hamlet with

the part of Hamlet left out," there must be a long with the tearful lamentations with which he is followed to the grave, some wise precautions by which, at the end of the hundred years, not only skull and bones, but teeth, toe-nails, heart, shreds of garments, nails of his coffin, etc., shall be in a good state of preservation, for they will all be in demand.

Then, at the end of the hundred years, the files of the *Visitor* and all his other published writings having been examined to see that they are all orthodox, he is canonized as a saint and a Doctor, his bones are dug up, and, along with all the precious little morsels I have referred to above, are deposited in a glass case in the splendid Cathedral in New York, in which he last officiated, there to constitute one of the curiosities to the sight of which tourists and strangers are admitted on the payment of a small fee to the sacristan. This is the first step, and the second in process of time follows. Inasmuch as he was Bishop of Richmond and Archbishop of Baltimore, the Cathedral churches in each of these cities lay claim to a part at least of the relics. There is a great dispute. The Pope has to be called in to settle it. A division is ordered, Richmond gets a few teeth, a toe-nail or two, and a piece of the coffin. Baltimore, being much larger, gets several of the larger bones, while a nail or two and a few strands of hair go to the church of which he was Parish

Priest before his elevation to the Episcopacy. The third step follows a century or two later. Baltimore, having grown to be a great commercial rival of New York, feels that she is entitled to the skull of the saint, which is considered the most honorable part. Unable to get it, a little pious fraud is resorted to, and a skull is manufactured to order and placed in a case with the relics. The jealousy of the New Yorkers is excited. A quarrel arises. The Pope is called in and decides that the Baltimore skull is the genuine one. A few years later his successor is appealed to, and decides for the New York skull, and so each party is happy, for has not each one the decision of an infallible Pontiff in favor of its own relic!

Our readers who are not familiar with the history of relics and relic-worship, may think all this a mere burlesque, but let them read any authentic treatise on the subject of relics from the one written by John Calvin in 1601 until the present time, and they will find that what I have sketched as possible in the future of the editor of the *Catholic Visitor*, is what has happened over and over again in reference to those whom the Roman Catholic Church has canonized as saints. Since the days of Constantine, who introduced the iniquitous traffic in relics, graves have been ravaged, skeletons torn apart and sold—spurious relics manufactured in large quantities, skulls and bones of favorite saints duplicated and multiplied to the

full extent of the credulity of the victims of imposture. Angilbert of Centule, A. D. 814, claimed to have the blood, hairs, and garments of John the Baptist, the bones of his father Zacharias, hairs of the blessed Virgin, shreds of her cloak and undergarments, drops of her breast milk, etc. (Scriptum S. Angilb, 14, 15.) At Corbie, at the same time, the same articles were claimed to be in possession, together with hair from the beard of Noah, the blood and hair of our Lord, part of the umbilical cord, of the manger, the cross, the napkin in the tomb, etc., etc. (Acta Bened. IV: I: 375, 376.) As to the "Holy coat" that was without seam, there were no less than *twenty-five* different ones in Europe at the same time, each claiming to be the original and genuine one, and each having high ecclesiastical authority to support its claim. In a single church in Rome at the present time, as we learn from M. Hobart Seymour—the church of Santa Croce—the catalogue which is hung up for public inspection near the chancel embraces the following among other articles: "Three pieces of the true cross; the title over it with the writing in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; two thorns from the crown of thorns; the cord with which Jesus was bound; the sponge which contained the gall and wormwood; part of the vail and hair of the Virgin; a vial full of the blood of Christ; a vial full of the milk of Mary; some earth from Calvary saturated with the blood of Christ; some of the manna

which fell in the wilderness; a tooth of St. Peter; a part of the head of John the Baptist," etc., etc.

In the church of St. Praxede, says the same author, is a catalogue carved in marble, near the altar, where all can read it, embracing, among other things, "a tooth of St. Peter and one of St. Paul, the chemise of the blessed Virgin, the swaddling clothes of our Lord, His girdle, etc., etc.' Kirwan tells us that in St. Peter's they show you the pillar against which Christ leaned, portions of the cross, and the head of St. Andrew; in St. John Lateran, the table at which the Lord's Supper was instituted; at the Mamertine, a stone, with a hollow on the surface made by the head of St. Peter when a soldier knocked him down and he fell on it; at *St. Pietre di Vinculo*, the chain that bound St. Peter and which the angel broke; at Milan, the brazen serpent which Moses made in the wilderness; at Cologne, the skeletons of the Magi, etc., etc.; while, to crown all, they claim to have in the St. John Lateran in Rome, a *bottle of the tears which Jesus shed at the grave of Lazarus, and a feather from the wing of the Angel Gabriel.*

May the day be far distant when the reverence paid by Protestants to the sleeping dust of God's departed saints shall give place to the "veneration" which the Church, represented by the *Catholic Visitor*, pays to "relics."

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

LETTER XX.

ROME AND CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

PETERSBURG, VA., May 11, 1881.

Messrs. Editors,—One of the most amusing phases of the Romanism of to-day is seen in the trenuous efforts made by its apologists to represent the Roman Catholic Church as having always been the friend of civil and religious liberty. Archbishop Gibbons, for instance, in that very remarkable book of his, "The Faith of our Fathers," says on page 222:

"I here assert the proposition, which I hope to confirm by historical evidence, that the Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty, and that whenever any encroachments on these sacred rights of man were perpetrated by professing members of the Catholic faith, these wrongs, far from being sanctioned by the Church, were committed in palpable violation of her authority."

And in the same strain we have had of late several editorials in the *Catholic Visitor*, from which it would appear that the seeds of religious

liberty in this country were planted, not so much at Jamestown, or Plymouth Rock, or Manhattan Island, as at St. Mary's, under the auspices of the Roman Catholics who planted their colonies on the sacred soil of Maryland.

Now our readers will scarcely need to be told that this is a "new departure," altogether, for the Roman Catholic Church. A few years ago the language of its public press, even in this country, was very different. Let me give only a few of many examples that I could quote.

In the *Shepherd of the Valley* published at St. Louis, Mo., one of the ablest and most influential organs of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, appeared on the 23d of November, 1851, the following editorial paragraph:

"The Church is of necessity intolerant. Heresy she inserts in her catalogue of mortal sins. She endures it when and where she must; but she hates it and directs all her energies to effect its destruction. If the Catholics ever gain—which they surely will do, though at a distant day—an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So say our enemies, so we believe."

In *Brownson's Review* for October, 1852, on page 456, are the following words:

"The liberty of heresy [and by heresy Roman Catholic writers mean Protestantism] and unbelief is *not* a right. * * * All the rights the

sects have, or can have, are derived from the State, and rest on expediency. As they have in their character of sects hostile to the true religion, no rights under the law of nature or the law of God, they are neither wronged nor deprived of liberty, if the State refuses to grant them any rights at all."

In the Pittsburgh *Catholic Visitor*, in 1848, appeared the following in reference to the suppression of a Protestant chapel in Rome by Pius IX:

"For our own part we take this opportunity of expressing our hearty delight at the suppression of the Protestant chapel at Rome. This may be thought intolerant, but when, we would ask, did we ever profess to be tolerant of Protestantism, or favor the doctrine that Protestantism ought to be tolerated. On the contrary we hate Protestantism; we detest it with our whole heart and soul, and we pray that our aversion to it may never decrease. We hold it meet that in the Eternal City no worship repugnant to God should be tolerated, and we are sincerely glad that the enemies of truth are no longer allowed to meet together in the Capital of the Christian world."

And, to quote only one further example, as late as April, 1870, we find the *Catholic World*, the leading Roman Catholic journal in this country, saying in an article on "Religious Liberty" —the first article of that issue,

"For ourselves, we do not pretend that the Church is, or ever has been tolerant. She is unde-

niably intolerant in her own order, as the law, as truth is intolerant, though she does not necessarily require the State to be intolerant. She certainly is opposed to what the nineteenth century calls religious liberty which, as we have seen, is simply the liberty of infidelity or irreligion."

It must be evident therefore that this is a "new departure" with Archbishop Gibbons and his followers. It is entirely a new role which the "one unchanging Church of the ages" is to be made to play for the sake of popularity. "*Always the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty.*' Do my eyes deceive me? Am I dreaming? No, there it stands in black and white on page 222 of "The Faith of our Fathers." "The Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty"—not the friend only but the "zealous promoter!" not sometimes or for the most part, but "always!" ALWAYS THE ZEALOUS PROMOTER!! It is said that wonders will never cease, and certainly one of the wonders of this day is that any honest man can claim that the Roman Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty.

Her very fundamental principles are opposed alike to civil and religious liberty. Her reiterated assertions through Popes, councils, and accredited theologians, of the Supremacy of the Pope over all governments, magistracies, and laws is enough of itself to settle this. Pope Innocent II declares

to be his by reason of his pontifical office, "the plentitude of spiritual things and the extent of temporal things: the mitre for the priesthood, and the crown for the kingdom, making me the lieutenant of Him who has it written on His thigh, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords," etc. The council which sat at Rome in 1075, and was presided over by Gregory VII, says of the Pope:

"He alone ought to wear the tokens of imperial dignity; all princes ought to kiss his feet. He has power to dethrone emperors and kings, and is to be judged by no man." And that this was no idle assumption of power, is evident from the fact that it was before the gate of this same Gregory VII, at Canusium, that the Emperor, Henry IV, stood three days in winter, barefooted, bareheaded, and wrapped in a coarse woolen cloth, shivering and doing penance, that he might obtain an audience with the offended and haughty Pontiff. It was this same Gregory VII, who, having granted the emperor absolution only on condition that he would submit to the decision of the Ecclesiastical Council which Gregory should convene, called a Council which, at his bidding, deposed Henry IV and chose a new emperor, to whom Gregory sent a crown with the motto upon it: "*Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodolpho.*" "The Rock gave the crown to Peter, and Peter to Rodolphus." Bellarmine says: "The Pope has the highest power of disposing of the temporal affairs

of all Christians in order to their spiritual good.'" (Bell. De Pont. Lib. v, Chap. 6.) Blasius says: "Kings ought to be under Peter, and must bow down and submit their necks to him, and his successors, who is prince and lord of all, whom all emperors and kings and potentates are subject to, and must humbly obey." (Blas. De Rom. Eccl. Dign. Tract. 7.)

We might multiply quotations to any extent; but look next at the teachings as to the relations of the clergy to the civil power. I give only one or two of many quotations.

The Council of the Lateran under Innocent III, says (Canon 43): "By the authority of the Holy Council we declare it unlawful for secular princes to require any oath of fidelity and allegiance of their clergy. We peremptorily forbid all priests from taking any such oath, if it be required.

Pope Gregory XIII (in a bull A. D. 1580) declares: "No secular judge may condemn a priest, and if he do, he shall be excommunicated."

And so, as to the obligation of oaths; it is declared in the Corpus Jur. Canonici (cap. Secut 27, Extrav. De Jurejurando): "No oath against the benefit of the Church is binding: all such oaths are perjuries." And Lessius, one of the great Doctors of Moral Theology approved in the Church, says, (Lib. II, Cap. 42, Dub. 12): "The Pope can annul and cancel every possible obligation aris-

ing from an oath," and Maynardus, another high authority, says: "The Pope has power in the whole world, in temporals and spirituals.—Statutes made by laymen do not bind the clergy." (Mayn. De Priv. Eccl. art. 13, sec. 19, etc).

How it is possible for Archbishop Gibbons to claim that a Church with such tenets has always been the zealous promoter of civil liberty, I leave my readers to conjecture.

And, as to the subject of religious liberty, the Archbishop is more completely handicapped for the novel race he proposes to run, than even in reference to civil liberty. The Roman Catholic Church *always* the zealous promoter of religious liberty! Was she zealously promoting religious liberty when she burned Wickliff's bones, for translating the Scriptures, and Huss for decrying indulgences? Was she promoting religious liberty when she kindled the fires of Smithfield, invented the tortures of the Spanish Inquisition, hunted the Waldenses of the Piedmont from cliff to cliff, and gloated over the horrid butcheries of the Huguenots on St. Bartholomew's Day? Archbishop Gibbons endeavors to relieve the Pope and Court of Rome of the odium of having sanctioned and exulted over the murder of Coligny and the massacre of thousands of unarmed and inoffensive Huguenots, men, women, and children, on that awful day. He says (Faith of our Fathers, page 250): "Pope Gregory XIII, to whom also

an envoy was sent, acting on this garbled information ordered a *te deum* to be sung, and a commemorative medal to be struck off in thanksgiving to God, not for the massacre, of which he was utterly ignorant, but for the preservation of the French king from an untimely and violent death, and of the French nation from the horrors of civil war."

Alas for the Archbishop, never were the facts of history more clearly and overwhelmingly in the face of a statement, than are the facts in this case as may readily be seen by consulting Baird's Rise of the Huguenots, vol. 2, pp. 539 ff, where the evidence, as drawn from original sources, is fully presented. That it was the slaughter of the Huguenots, and not the safety of the king over which the Pope and his court exulted with such transports of joy, is evident from the following facts: (1) The king was in no danger. (2) There had been great coolness between him and the Pope because of Charles leaning toward toleration. (3) Over the entrance to the church in which the Pope had ordered High Mass to be said in honor of the event, was affixed in large letters a proclamation of thanksgiving that the king of France, "inflamed by zeal for the Lord God of hosts, had, like a smiting angel divinely sent, suddenly destroyed by a single slaughter almost all the heretics and enemies of his kingdom." (4) A medal was struck by order of the Pope,

having on one side, the head of the Pope, and the words Greg. XIII, Pont. Max. An. I; and on the other an angel with cross and sword pursuing the heretics, and the superscription "*Uganottorum Strages* 1572." "Slaughter of the Huguenots 1572." (5) By order of the Pope, the famous Vasari painted in *Sala Regia*, several pictures representing scenes in the massacre. These paintings still remain and may be seen. Upon one is the terse inscription, "*Pontifix Colinii necem probat.*" "The Pope approves the slaughter of Coligny."

The hardest task I know is that which the Archbishop and his disciples have undertaken, that of proving that the Roman Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of civil and religious liberty. I would as soon undertake to prove that the Czars of Russia have always been.

The very oath of office which every bishop is required to take at his consecration, is as follows, (see Pontif. Rom. De. Cons. elect. in Episc., p. 47):

"I. N, from this hour will be faithful to my Lord the Pope and his successors; the counsel they entrust to me I will never discover to any man to the injury of the Pope. I will assist them to retain and defend the popedom, and the royalties of St. Peter against all men. I will carefully conserve, defend, and promote the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the Pope. I will not be in any council, pact, or treaty in which any-

thing perjudicial to the person, rights, or power of the Pope is contrived. And, if I shall know any such things, I will hinder them with all my power, and will speedily make them known to the Pope. To the utmost of my power I will observe the Pope's commands and make others observe them. All heretics and all rebels to my Lord the Pope I will persecute and impugn."

This is the Bishop's oath—doubtless the same that was taken by Bishop Jannsens in the midst of that imposing pageant that was held in Richmond a few weeks ago.

Very ominous are those words of the *Shepherd of the Valley*: "If the Catholics ever gain an immense numerical majority in this country, religious freedom is at an end." "Forewarned is forearmed." Let the history of Austria, Italy, Spain, Mexico, teach us to prize our liberties, and to know that they can only be retained by keeping this in the future, as it has been in the past, a Protestant country.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.